DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 710 HE 002 399

AUTHOR Johnson, Lydia; Swope, Mary Ruth

TITLE Facts About Curricula in Home Economics in Institutions of Higher Education.

INSTITUTION Eastern Illinois Univ., Charleston.

PUB DATE 70

NOTE 131p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Evaluation; Higher Education; *Home Economics; *Home Economics Education; *Surveys

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain information for a comparison of home economics curricula. A representative sample of home economics units offering at least a BA degree were surveyed and institutional catalogs were reviewed. The questionnaire sought data on: numbers of undergraduate and graduate majors enrolled in Fall 1968; distribution of majors within various home economics curricula, size of enrollments, number of degrees awarded in the last academic year, number of seniors expecting to pursue graduate study and to accept employment in elementary school teaching; number of full-time equivalent staff, opinions of administrators about current and future trends and about influential innovators in the field. State, land-grant, denominational, private and municipal institutions were sampled. This report presents and discusses findings of the survey. (JS)

ED054710

FEB 25 1971

Facts About Curricula in Home Economics in Higher Education

A NATIONAL SURVEY

By Lydia Johnson
Mary Ruth Swope

HE 002 399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED054710

FACTS ABOUT CURRICULA IN HOME ECONOMICS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BY

Dr. Lydia Johnson
Dr. Mary Ruth Swope

Duplicated by
School of Home Economics
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois
1970

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This monograph is the result of the joint effort of two professional home economists. Several aspects of this project were shared equally by the researchers; others were not.

Dr. Lydia Johnson, former Head of Home Economics at Western Illinois University accepted the lion's share of responsibility for securing the college catalogs and abstracting data from them. She also prepared data gathered from both the catalogs and the questionnaires for the key punch operation.

Dr. Mary Ruth Swope, Dean of the School of Home Economics at Eastern Illinois University, assumed the lion's share of responsibility for presenting and analyzing the data received from the computer operation and for abstracting it in Journal article form. Each researcher is willing to assume full responsibility for her aspect of the project.

Special appreciation is due the secretary of the Eastern Illinois University School of Home Economics, Mrs. Carol Noland, for her thoughtful suggestions in the typing of the manuscript from a very, very rough draft. Student workers also gave their assistance and support. Special thanks are due Mrs. Susan Rutan for mathematical computations and Mrs. Kathy Pierce Duncan for the construction of tables. Grateful acknowledgement is due Mrs. Marilyn Hepworth, a graduate student assistant, for the final editing of the manuscript. Susan Cornwell and Stephen Brown gave last minute assistance.

Acknowledgement of a small grant by the Council on Research of Eastern Illinois University is hereby made; this financial assistance made possible the employment of student help. The Data Processing

Center's donation of labor by Miss Judy Williams and of machine time is also gratefully acknowledged.

Appreciation by Dr. Swope is due her husband, Don, for his patience and understanding in being home alone for nearly two months of nights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURE	2
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	18
SUMMARY	80
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	88
FOOTNOTES	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	93
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	95
Appendix B	119

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Catalogs Used in Study, by Year	3
II	Distribution of the 108 Respondents, by Type of Institution	5
III	Distribution of the 108 Respondents, by Region of U.S.A.	6
IV	Distribution of Respondents by Type of School Term.	6
V	Distribution of Total Respondents by Type of Administrative Unit	7
VI	Distribution of Type of Administration of Home Economics Unit, by Type of Institution, 1968-1969	9
VII	Distribution of Faculty in Home Economics, Fall 1968-1969	10
VIII	Distribution of Home Economics Faculty, by Type of Institution	10
IX	Distribution of Faculty, by Type of Administration.	11-12
X	Number of Volumes in Library.	12
XI	Percent Distribution of Institutions by Number of Undergraduate Majors, Fall 1968-1969.	13
XII	Distribution of Respondents, by Number of Hours Required for Graduation.	14
XIII	Distribution of Respondents, by Type of Undergraduate Degrees Offered	14
XIV	Total Bachelor's Degrees Awarded, 1968-1969	15
XV	Distribution by Types of Master's Degrees Offered	16
XVI	Total Master's Degrees Awarded, 1968-1969	16
XVII	Distribution of Doctorates, by Type of Degrees Offered.	17
XVIII	Total Number of Doctorates Awarded, 1968-1969	17

LIST OF TABLES (Con't.)

Table		Page
XIX	Total Number and Types of Doctorates Awarded, 1968-1969.	17
XX	Number of Home Economics Undergraduate Courses Listed. .	20
XXI	Frequency of Distribution of Various Home Economics Majors	21
XXII	Analysis of Semester Hours Required in Home Economics Education Major.	23
XXIII	Analysis of Semester Hours Required in Foods and Nutrition Major.	24
XXIV	Analysis of Semester Hours Required in Clothing and Textiles Major	26
XXV	Number of Different Types of Majors, by Type of Institution.	27
XXVI	Distribution of Number of Types of Home Economics Majors Offered, by Size of Home Economics Faculty. . . .	28
XXVII	Summary of General Education Requirements for all Home Economics Majors, Fall 1968-1969.	28
XXVIII	Distribution of General Education Requirements of Home Economics Majors in Relation to Total Hours Required for Graduation, Fall 1968-1969.	30
XXIX	Summary of Semester Hours of General Education Required in the Home Economics Major, Fall 1968-1969.	31
XXX	Distribution of Professional Education Requirements of Home Economics Majors in Relation to Total Hours Required	32
XXXI	Distribution of Home Economics Requirements of Home Economics Majors in Relation to Total Hours Required for Graduation, Fall 1968-1969	32
XXXII	Distribution of Electives of Home Economics Majors in Relation to Total Hours Required for Graduation, Fall 1968-1969	33
XXXIII	Total Semester Hours Required of Home Economics Majors for Graduation, Fall 1968-1969	36

LIST OF TABLES (Con't)

Table		Page
XXXIV	Distribution of Respondents Offering a Home Economics Core	41
XXXV	Respondents' Semester Hour Requirements in the Core Required of all Majors at Institutions	42
XXXVI	Home Economics Core, by Type of Institution	42
XXXVII	Number of Hours in Home Economics Core, by Type of Institution	43
XXXVIII	Number of Minors Offered	44
XXXIX	Types of Minors Offered in the Home Economics Units .	45
XL	Smallest Lecture Enrollments, by Type of Institution	47
XLI	Smallest Lecture Class Enrollments, by Type of Administration	48
XLII	Preparation of Generalists Versus Specialists in Home Economics	50
XLIII	Recent Changes in Home Economics Curricula	51
XLIV	Added Home Economics Curricular Offerings, by Type of Institution	51
XLV	Offering Programs for Older Undergraduate Students, by Type of Institution	53
XLVI	Design Refresher Courses for "Out-of-Date" Home Economics Graduates, by Type of Institution	54
XLVII	Educational Television Courses for Credit, Undergraduate Level, by Type of Institution	54
XLVIII	Educational Television Courses for Graduate Credit, by Type of Institution	55
XLIX	Correspondence Courses, Undergraduate Level, by Type of Institution	56
L	Correspondence Courses, Graduate Level, by Type of Institution	57

LIST OF TABLES (Con't)

Table		Page
LI	Frequency of Offering Extension Courses Other than Cooperative Extension, by Type of Institution	57
LII	Home Economics Televison Courses for Credit, by Type of Institution	57
LIII	Distribution of Respondents' Opinions of Forces Exerting Greatest Impact on Curricula Change	58
LIV	Designing Standardized Home Economics Achievement Test, by Type of Institution	59
LV	Offering Associate Degree Programs in Four Year Institutions, by Type of Institution	60
LVI	Employment of a Curriculum Consultant Within Past Five Years, by Type of Institution	61
LVII	Acceptance of Home Economics as a General Education Subject, by Type of Institution	61
LVIII	Innovations in Home Economics, by Type of Institution	62
LIX	Innovations in Teaching Methods, by Type of Institution	63
LX	New Ideas, by Type of Institution	63
LXI	Future Plans for Interdisciplinary Progress, by Type of Institution	64
LXII	Offerings to Help Students Understand Poverty, by Type of Institution	65
LXIII	Promotion of Home Economics Research, by Type of Institution	66
LXIV	Interdisciplinary or Interdepartmental Progress, by Type of Institution	66
LXV	Changing the Name of the Home Economics Unit, by Type of Institution	68
LXVI	Adviseability of Recruiting Academically Talented Students	72
LXVII	Recruiting More Men Students in Home Economics, by Type of Institution	73

LIST OF TABLES (Con't)

Table		Page
LXVIII	Recruiting More Men Faculty Members, by Type of Institution.	74
LXIX	Recruiting More Minors in Home Economics, by Type of Institution.	76
LXX	Graduate Record Examination, by Type of Institution. . .	77
LXXI	Estimate of Number of 1968-1969 Seniors Who Will Do Graduate Work Within the Next Three Years.	78
LXXII	Estimate of Graduates Who Will Teach Elementary Education.	79
LXXIII	Training of Home Economics "PROGRAM WRITERS"	79
	TABLES IN APPENDIX A	
I	Type of School Term, by Type of Institution.	96
II	Tabulation of Home Economics Courses Offered, Fall 1968-1969.	97
III	Number of Home Economics Undergraduate Courses Listed. .	98
IV	Distribution of the Semester Hour Requirements of Home Economics Courses in the Home Economics Education Major.	99
V	Distribution of the Semester Hour Requirements of Home Economics Courses in the Foods and Nutrition Major . . .	100
VI	Distribution of Home Economics Semester Hour Requirements in Various Home Economics Majors.	101
VII	Distribution of General Education Requirements for Majors in Home Economics, Fall 1968-1969	102
VIII	Distribution of Semester Hours of General Education Subjects Required of Home Economics Majors, Fall 1968-1969.	103-4
IX	General Education Requirements by Type of Institution. .	105
X	Professional Education Requirements by Type of Institution.	106
XI	Home Economics Requirements by Type of Institution . . .	107

LIST OF TABLES (Con't)

Table		Page
XII	Electives by Type of Institution.	108
XIII	Total Hours Required by Type of Institution	109
XIV	Characteristics of Home Economics Core Requirements in Responding Institutions	110
XV	Semester Hours Required in Minors Included in this Study	111
XVI	Largest Lecture by Type of Institution.	112
XVII	Average Lecture Enrollment by Type of Institution . . .	113
XVIII	Smallest Lecture Enrollment by Type of Institution. . .	114
XIX	Smallest Lecture Enrollment by Type of Administration .	115
XX	Largest Lab Enrollment by Type of Institution	116
XXI	Average Lab Enrollment by Type of Institution	117
XXII	Smallest Lab Enrollment by Type of Institution.	118

INTRODUCTION

> There seems to be at present no subject more capable of exciting and holding attention among thoughtful people in America than the question of the Education of Girls. We may answer it as we will, we may refuse to answer it, but it will not be postponed...and until it is answered on more rational grounds than that of previous customs... it may be expected to present itself at every turn, to crop out of every stratum of civilized thought.[1]

The social, economic, political and cultural context around which this quotation was written in 1874 was different from our contemporary social system and problems. Despite this fact, the basic issue of the education of young women referred to in this passage is stated with amazing clarity for today. Women have earned much of their legal, political, social, and economic rights within the past century, but problems of "how" and "when" and "for what purpose" to educate women are still largely unresolved.

Especially within the past fifty years, a drastic change has taken place in society's attitude toward women's education and employment. This change has resulted, in part, because of the rapid technological and scientific developments which have characterized this period. The role of women has both expanded and become highly complex. Hawkes[2] has rather accurately and succintly described this changing pattern in the lives of American women when she wrote:

> Here, then, is our woman of 1970: probably a college graduate,wife, mother and worker, as well as political participant, community promoter, and "culture bearer" for her society.

The profession of home economics has been very much involved in this whole matter. It has had as its main purpose service to society

through providing "training basic to the attainment and maintenance of the well-being of individuals, families and homes, and the preservation of values significant in home life."[3]

The professional programs designed by various home economics units within institutions of higher education have been many and varied. For a historical perspective of the development of curricula in home economics, the reader is referred to the work of Dr. Earl McGrath[4] and Barbara M. Ferrar[5]; this is not within the purpose or scope of this study.

The aim of this study was to survey a representative sample of home economics units offering at least a baccalaureate degree to obtain basic facts about their current programs in home economics. Although the main emphasis was on a comparison of curricula, there was also an attempt made to gather ancillary information that is related to the total program. Opinions of home economics administrators on current issues and trends in home economics were also sought in an effort to project what might be important influences on future home economics offerings. It is hoped that this information will be helpful to home economics professionals and others interested in knowing more about current home economics programs in institutions of higher education.

PROCEDURE

Methods Used to Collect Data

Data used in this study were collected by two primary methods: (1) by studying the institution catalog for a recent year and (2) through the use of a questionnaire designed to secure certain facts from the home economics unit* administrator.

*Home Economics Unit is defined to mean a Division, College, School, or Department of Home Economics.

A. College Catalogs Used.

From the table below it can be seen that nearly 80 percent of the catalogs used in this study were from the year 1968-69 or 1969-70, or a combination of the two.

Only 6 percent of the catalogs used were three years old-from the 1967-68 school year.

TABLE I CATALOGS USED IN STUDY, BY YEAR

College Catalogs	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1967-69	1968-70	Other	Total
Number	6	47	23	17	14	1	108
Percent	5.6%	43.5%	21.3%	15.7%	13%	0.9%	100%

B. The Questionnaire.

The questionnaire sought general information about the home economics unit in regard to such matters as the number of undergraduate and graduate majors enrolled in the fall 1968-69, the distribution of undergraduate and graduate majors within various home economics curricula, the size of the home economics course enrollments, the number of degrees awarded in the last school year, those seniors expected to do graduate work, seniors expected to accept employment in elementary school teaching, the number of full-time equivalent staff, and the opinions of administrators about some current issues and problems in home economics programs in higher education. Administrators were also asked to name the constituents who have the greatest impact on them in bringing about change in home economics curricula.

The questionnaire was mailed on May 15, 1969 to all administrators of home economics units of selected institutions within each of the subgroups. On January 25, 1970 a second letter was mailed to those who had not yet responded. By June 15, 1970, a total of 108 questionnaires had be returned and are included in the study.

Several administrators asked not to be included in the study and these units were replaced by random selection from among the remaining schools within the same subgroup.

See Appendix B Page 119 for copy of the questionnaire

College catalogs from each participating institution were obtained and studied. Letters to administrators of home economics units were written to clarify unclear materials and to seek additional needed information.

The Sampling Procedure

The decision to not sample the total universe of institutions granting bachelors or higher degrees in home economics was made early; it was decided to use a random sampling of all institutions within various subgroups of the universe. The subgroups of institutions included in this study were: (1) state, (2) land-grant, (3) denominational, (4) private and (5) municipal.

The primary source of the universe of institutions was a publication available through the American Home Economics Association entitled,"Colleges and Universities with Undergraduate Majors in Home Economics, Revised, June 1967." Data in this publication was gathered by AHEA and based on information furnished by home economics administrators in the spring of 1967.

Specific institutions within the subgroups to be sampled were selected by the use of a table of random numbers and under the direction of Dr. Dale Robey, Assistant Director of Testing Services, Eastern Illinois University.

Tabulation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Data from the catalogs were converted and recorded on data processing punch cards according to a previously designed code. The cards were sorted, and tallies and frequencies were made by means of an electronic computer. Separate tallies and percentages were run on selected items, using the correlates of type of institution, type of administration, number of home economics faculty, and size of library.

Description of Respondents

Distribution by Type of Institution

The following table gives the distribution of the responding institutions according to type of institution.

Table II DISTRIBUTION OF THE 108 RESPONDENTS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Respondents	State	Land-Grant	Denominational	Private	Municipal	Total
Number	57	14	17	18	2	108
Percent	52.8	13.0	15.7	16.7	1.9	100.1

Since the total universe of institutions offering a bachelor's or higher degree in home economics contains a much higher number of State universities than others, it is not surprising that our study includes a much higher percentage of institutions within this subgroup than any other.

Distribution by Region of USA

The classification of regions used in this study enables the reader to quickly see that all regions of the United States were

represented with the greatest representation being from the East North Central. With the heavy concentration of colleges and universities within this area, it is not surprising to find this distribution. See Table III below.

Table III DISTRIBUTION OF THE 108 RESPONDENTS, BY REGION OF U.S.A.

Respondents	New England	Middle Atlantic	East North Central	West North Central	South Atlantic	East South Atlantic	West South Atlantic	Mountain	Pacific	Total
Number	4	9	20	13	16	17	15	8	6	108
Percent	3.7	8.3	18.5	12.0	14.8	15.7	13.9	7.4	5.6	99.9

Description of Respondents

Distribution by Type of School Term

From Table IV below it can be seen that the overwhelming majority (80 percent) of the institutions in this study operate on the semester system. Although new patterns of operation have been emerging, i.e., the 4-1-4 and trimester plans, it is apparent that these new techniques have not been widely accepted by the schools in this study.

Table IV DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL TERM

Type of School Term									
Quarter		Semester		Trimester		Other		Total	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
18	16.8	86	80.4	1	0.9	2	1.9	107	100

Type of School Term by Type of Institution

Data for this item were collected for 107 of the 108 schools in this study. Of that number, 80 percent had the semester system; 17 percent the

quarter system; 1 percent the trimester. No private or muncipal schools had the quarter system. More land-grant than other institutions had the quarter plan but only 28.6 of all land-grant schools were on this plan.

See Table I in Appendix A for additional information.

Distribution of Respondents by Type of Administration of Home Economics Units.

As would be expected from the history of the development of institutions of higher education, the methods of internally administering college and university programs are many and varied. Nine such methods were identified in this study. See Table below.

Table V DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS, BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

	Type of Administrative Unit									
Total Respondents	Auto-nomous	Educ. Units	Fine Arts	Applied Art & Sc.	Agric.	Soc. Sci.	Nat. Sci.	Not Indicated	Other	Total
Number	33	12	6	21	4	4	7	14	7	108
Percent	30.6	11.1	5.6	19.4	3.7	3.7	6.5	13.0	6.5	100.1

From this it can be seen that nearly one-third of all institutions had autonomous administration. Nearly 20 percent were in the applied arts or sciences unit; 11 percent were in education; 6.5 percent were located in the natural science unit; 5.6 percent in the fine arts unit and nearly 4 percent in both the agriculture unit and the social science unit.

It could be concluded that home economics units are administered by diverse patterns and that a larger number are autonomous units than any other type.

Type of Administration of Home Economics Unit by Type of Institution

A study of the type of administration of the home economics unit by type of institution showed the following facts: (See Table VI)

1- State Institutions

The largest number of state schools 16 (28 percent) in this study had autonomous administrative units; the home economics administrator is directly responsible to the Dean or Vice President of Instruction. Of all autonomous units in this study, nearly half (49 percent) were state schools. Of the state schools 19 percent had their home economics units in education units and 19 percent were in applied art or science units.

2- Land-Grant Institutions

More than half of the land-grant institutions in this study (57 percent) were administered autonomously. One fifth (21 percent) were in agriculture units. When all home economics units located in agriculture units were considered, 75 percent were in land-grant institutions.

3- Denominational Institutions

Nearly one third of all denominational home economics units were administered through applied arts or science units. Equal numbers of units (3 units or 18 percent) were autonomous; in social science units; and in natural science units. In the latter two categories, this represented 75 percent and 43 percent of all denominational schools, respectively.

4- Private Institutions

More private institutions (33 percent) had autonomous administration

Than any other type; 3 schools were located in the applied arts or science unit and another 3 were in the natural science unit.

5- Municipal Institutions

Of the two municipal institutions in this study, one was located in the applied arts or science unit and the other in the natural science unit.

Table VI DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF ADMINISTRATION OF HOME ECONOMICS UNIT BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, 1968-69

Type of Institution	Auton-omous	Educ. Unit	Fine Arts	Applied Arts or Science	Agric.	Soc. Sci.	Nat. Sci.	Other
	# %	# %	# %	# %	# %	# %	# %	# %
State	16-28.1	11-19.3	6-10.5	11-19.3	1-1.8	1-1.8	0-0.0	11-19.3
Land-Grant	8-57.1	1-7.1	0-0.0	1-7.1	3-21.4	0-0.0	0-0.0	1-7.1
Denomi-national	3-17.6	0-0.0	0-0.0	5-29.4	0-0.0	3-17.6	3-17.6	3-17.6
Private	6-33.3	0-0.0	0-0.0	3-16.7	0-0.0	0-0.0	3-16.7	6-33.4
Municipal	0-0.0	0-0.0	0-0.0	1-50	0-0.0	0-0.0	1-50	0-0.0

Description of Respondents by Size of Home Economics Faculty

When considering all institutions in this study, about:

49 percent had faculties with six or less persons
17 percent had faculties with 7-9 persons
20 percent had faculties with 10-20 persons
13 percent had faculties with 21 or more persons
8 percent had faculties with 30 or more persons

From this data it can also be seen that the average faculty size of the respondents in this study was 9.7 persons. See Table VII below.

Table VII DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY IN HOME ECONOMICS, FALL 1969-70

	Number of Home Economics Faculty									
Respondents	Not Mentioned	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17-20	21-30	More Than 30	Total
Number	1	27	26	18	5	12	5	5	9	108
Percent	1%	25	24.1	16.7	4.6	11.1	4.6	4.6	8.3	99.9

Size of Home Economics Faculty, By Type of Institution

Staffs with three or less faculty predominate in denominational, private, and municipal institutions; half or more of all these institutions were in this category. The great majority of these schools had less than 7 staff members.

Only state and land-grant institutions had a significant number of staff (38 percent and 71 percent respectively) with 10 or more persons.

Land-grant institutions were the only ones who had a sizeable number of staffs with more than 30 persons. See Table below.

Table VIII DISTRIBUTION OF HOME ECONOMICS FACULTY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Respondents		3 or less	Less than 7	10 or more	More than 30
State	#	9	20	22	2
	%	15.8	37	38	3.5
Land-Grant	#	0	3	10	5
	%	0	21.4	71	35.7
Denom	#	9	16	1	1
	%	53	94	5.9	5.9
Private	#	9	12	3	1
	%	50	67	17	5.6
Municipal	#	1	2	0	0
	%	50	100	0	0

Size of Home Economics Faculty, By Type of Administration

When 87 institutions (81 percent) were analyzed by location within a given type of administrative unt, the following facts emerged:

a- larger percentages of smaller faculties (six or less in a unit) were located in education, applied arts or sciences, social science and natural science units. No home economics faculties located in agriculture units were this small.

b- nearly 2/3 of the larger home economics faculties (21 or more persons) were located in autonomous units.

c- of the middle range size of home economics faculties (10-20 persons):

(1) 32% were in autonomous units
(2) 18% were in fine and professional arts units
(3) 18% were in applied arts or science units
(4) 14% were in education units
(5) 9% were in agriculture units

See Table IX below

Table IX DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY, BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATION

Type of Administrative Unit	No. of Home Economics Faculty, By Type of Administration							
	6 or less Faculty		9 or less Faculty		10-20 Faculty		20 or more Faculty	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Autonomous	13	38.4	17	50.5	7	21.2	9	27.3
Education	6	50.0	9	75.0	3	25.0	0	0.0
Fine or Prof. Arts	2	33.4	0	0.0	4	66.6	0	0.0
Applied Arts or Science	12	57.1	15	61.4	4	19.1	2	9.5

Table IX DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY, BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATION (Cont.)

	6 or less Faculty		9 or less Faculty		10-20 Faculty		20 or more Faculty	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Agriculture	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
Social Science	3	75.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Natural Science	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	17	80.9			2	9.0	2	9.8

Description of Respondents by Volumes in Library

About half of the catalogs studied did not mention the size of the library as measured by volumes on hand. About one fourth of the institutions (25.9 percent) reported from under 100,000 to 299,999. Ten percent of institutions reported from 500,000 to more than 1 million volumes. See Table X below.

Table X NUMBER OF VOLUMES IN LIBRARY

Respondents	Not Mentioned	Under 100,000	100,000 199,999	200,000 299,999	300,000 399,999	400,000 499,999	500,000 599,999	600,000 1,000,000	More than 1,000,000	Total
Number	45	16	16	12	5	3	2	6	3	108
Percent	41.7	14.8	14.8	11.1	4.6	2.8	1.9	5.6	2.8	100.1

Description of Respondents by Number of Undergraduate Majors

From Table XI below it can be seen that nearly 15 percent of all respondents did not reveal the number of undergraduate majors in their institution for Fall 1968-69. Of those who did, slightly more than one-third (37 percent) had enrollments of 120 or fewer majors; 30 percent had from 121 to 299 majors and 19 percent had more than 300 majors.

TABLE XI PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF INSTITUTIONS BY NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS, FALL 1968-69

Type and # of Schools	Did not Respond	0-120 Majors	121-299	300-499	Over 500
	%	%	%	%	%
State (57)	11	20	44	18	9
Land-grant (14)	29	21	21	7	21
Denominational (17)	18	77	6	-	-
Private (18)	17	72	11	-	-
Municipal (2)	-	50	50	-	-
Total Percent for all Institutions	14.8	37.0	29.6	10.2	8.3

A recent study completed by Gorman and Harper[6] revealed very interesting facts about the change in size of home economics units in the United States and Puerto Rico as measured by number of undergraduate majors. The study compares data for the two decades of 1949-59 and 1959-69. Pertinent facts that have relevance here are:

> "Between 1949 and 1959 the number of home economics programs in higher education increased from 408 to 438. Even with increase in number the size of most home economics units decreased, when measured by undergraduate enrollment. Between the fall of 1949 and the fall of 1959 the number of home economics programs with less than 100 undergraduate majors increased by 14 percent; between 1959 and 1969 the number of home economics programs in this category decreased by 45 percent. Thus within the past two decades there was an overall total reduction of nine percent in the number of home ec programs in higher education having less than 100 undergraduate majors enrolled in each program."

Description by Number of Hours Required for Graduation

Respondents in this study follow a rather common pattern in regard to hours required for graduation. Slightly more than two-thirds require between 123 and 131 semester hours while approximately one-third require between 126 and 128. The total range of hours required

was from 120 to 140 semester hours.

Table XII DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS, BY NUMBER OF HOURS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION

	Total Semester Hours Required							
Respondents	120-2	123-5	126-8	129-31	132-5	136-40	Varies	Total
Number	11	21	32	20	16	5	3	108
Percent	10.2	19.4	29.6	18.5	14.8	4.6	2.8	99.9

Description of Respondents by Type of Degrees Offered in Home Economics

Undergraduate Degrees

Bachelor's Degrees Offered, 1968-69

More than two-thirds (70 percent) of the respondents offer either a BA, BS, or a combination of the two as the only baccalaureate degrees. See Table XIII below. Although the BS in Home Economics was available in only one-fourth of the institutions (23.2 percent), it was offered more frequently than the Bachelor of Science in Education degree (17.7 percent).

Table XIII DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS, BY TYPE OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES OFFERED

	Type of Undergraduate Degree								
Respondents	BA	BS	BS in Educ.	BS in Home Ec.	BA & BS	BA & BS in Home Ec. BS in Educ.	BS, BS in Educ. BS in Home Ec.	Combin-ation of 2 or more	Total
Number	16	39	7	13	20	2	10	1	108
Percent	14.8	36.1	6.5	12.0	18.5	1.9	9.3	0.9	100.0

Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded, 1968-69

Of the 81 percent of the respondents who answered this item, 12 (11 percent) reported from 0-10 bachelor's degrees awarded; 10 respondents (9 percent) reported more than 100 and 3 (2.7 percent) reported more

than 160 graduates.

According to Gorman and Harper, "In 1958-59, 75 percent of all degree-granting home economics units in higher education conferred less than 21 degrees each; in 1968-69, 50 percent of all such units conferred more than 20 degrees each."[7] Of those respondents in this study who answered this item, 64.7 percent reported 20 or more degrees conferred. This would seem to be a reasonable expectation since enrollments in home economics, particularly in the last of the sixties, were showing great increases and since,"...1968-69 (was) a year which held the record for production of degrees in home economics at all levels."[8] See Table XIV below.

Table XIV TOTAL BACHELOR'S DEGREES AWARDED, 1968-69

Number of Persons Receiving Bachelor's Degrees										
Schools	No Ans.	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-50	51-70	71-100	101-130	131-160	More 160
Number	20	12	19	14	19	7	7	4	3	3
Percent	18.5	11.1	17.6	13.0	17.6	6.5	6.5	3.7	2.8	2.8

Description of Respondents, By Type of Master's Degrees

Master's Degrees Offered, 1968-69

Of the schools in this study, 72 schools (67 percent) do not offer a master's degree of any type. Of those who do offer this degree, the two most frequently offered degrees are the Master of Science (17 percent) and the Master of Science in Education (11 percent). The Master of Science in Home Economics was offered by three percent of the schools. See Table below.

Table XV DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF MASTERS DEGREES OFFERED

Respondents	Types of Masters Degrees Offered									
	None	MA	MS	MA & MS	MS in Educ.	MS & MS in Educ.	MA & MS in Educ.	MS in H. Ec.	Other	Total
Number	72	5	14	1	8	4	0	3	1	108
Percent	66.7	4.6	13.0	0.9	7.4	3.7	0	2.8	0.9	100

Number of Master's Degrees Awarded, 1968-69

Of all respondents in this study, 76 (70 percent) either did not answer this item or gave a "none" answer. As can be seen from the table below, the frequency distribution of number of master's degrees conferred was quite evenly scattered among all of the categories. Nine institutions (8 percent) awarded fewer than five degrees in 1968-69 while 7 institutions (6 percent) awarded 21 or more master's degrees.

Table XVI TOTAL MASTERS DEGREES AWARDED, 1968-69

Respondents	Number of Masters Degrees Awarded									
	No Ans. or None	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17-20	21-24	25 or More
Number	76	5	4	5	3	3	2	3	4	3
Percent	70.4	4.6	3.7	4.6	2.7	2.7	1.9	2.7	3.7	2.7

Description of Respondents, By Types of Doctorates

Doctorates Offered, 1968-69

From the table below it can be seen that 91 percent of the institutions in this study do not offer doctorates. The Doctor of Philosphy degree was offered more frequently than either the Doctor of Education or the PhD and Ed D combined.

Table XVII DISTRIBUTION OF DOCTORATES, BY TYPE OF DEGREES OFFERED

Respondents	No Doctorates	Ed.D Only	PhD Only	EdD & PhD	Total
Number	98	1	6	3	108
Percent	90.8	0.9	5.6	2.8	100

Number of Doctorates Awarded, by Respondents, 1968-69

As might be surmised, 104 respondents (96 percent) reported that no doctorates were awarded from their institutions in 1968-69. Two respondents reported awarding one doctorate each; two reported awarding four doctorates each. See Table XVIII.

Table XVIII. TOTAL NUMBER OF DOCTORATES AWARDED, BY RESPONDENTS, 1968-69

	Number of Doctorates Awarded					
Respondents	None	1	2	3	4	5 or more
Number	104	2	0	0	2	0
Percent	96.3	1.9	0	0	1.9	0

Types of Doctorates Awarded, By Respondents, 1968-69

Doctorates awarded by the institutions in this study follow the general pattern known well to home economists-few are annually awarded. Only 8 percent of the responding institutions offered some type of doctorate; the ratio of those offering Ed'D degrees over PhD degrees was slightly more than 2:1.

Table XIX NUMBER AND TYPES OF DOCTORATES AWARDED, 1968-69

	Types of Doctorates			
Respondents	Ed.D	PhD	None	Total
Number	7	3	98	108
Percent	6.5	2.8	90.7	100.0

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Types and Number of Home Economics Courses Taught

Data for this section were not available for ten institutions; all percentages cited, therefore, are for 98 institutions.

As would be expected, F & N, C & T, CD & FR, H. Mgt & Family Econ were offered by 97 percent of the institutions.

Subjects offered less frequently were Home Economics Education (22.2 percent), Institution Adminstration (27.8 percent) and Family Health (50.9 percent).

An analysis of interesting facts about the number of different courses offered Fall 1968-69 within the various subject matter areas would include the following:

Foods and Nutrition
61 (42% offered from 5-8 courses
(19% offered from 9-12 courses
5% offered more than 16 courses
No school offered less than 3 courses

Clothing and Textiles
83 (35% offered 5-8 courses
(48% offered 5-12 courses
31% offered 4 or less courses
5% offered more than 16 courses

Child Development and Family Relations
57 (25% offered 2 or less courses
(32% offered 3-5 courses
25% offered 5-12 courses
2% offered 16 or more courses

Housing and Equipment
73 (35% offered 1 course
(38% offered 2 courses
7% offered 3-4 courses
1% offered 9-12 courses
None offered more than 12 courses

Home Management and Family Economics

42 (7% offered 1 course
(35% offered 2 courses
30% offered 3-4 courses
4% offered 9-12 courses
None offered more than 12 courses

Home Economics Education

34 (21% offered 1 course
(13% offered 2 courses
20% offered 3-4 courses
10% offered 5-8 courses
1% offered 9-12; 13-16; more than 16 respectively

Basic Design

53 (28% offered 1 course
(25% offered 2 courses
18% offered 3-4 courses
2% offered more than 16 courses

From these figures it can be seen that the largest number of courses were offered in the areas of F & N and C & T. This would tend to substantiate the often repeated fact that while leaders in home economics are advocating more expertise in Consumer Economics, Child Development and Family Living and Home Management, undergraduate programs are helping students to feel more competent in "Cooking and Sewing".

See Table II in Appendix A for more information of the types and number of home economics courses taught in Fall 1968-69.

Certain courses are appearing in the home economics offerings in college catalogs but are not yet offered by a majority of institutions in this study. A list of these subjects follows, in ranked order:

Subject	Percent Offering Subject, 1968-69
Field Experience	22.2
Special Problems	28.7
Independent Study	29.6
Demonstration Techniques	31.5
Seminar	33.3
Orientation to Home Economics	38.0

Number of Home Economics Undergraduate Courses Listed

The largest frequency of institutions fell in the 20-29 "undergraduate courses listed" category while the average number of courses listed by the institutions in this study was 37. A rather significant number of institutions (20.5 percent) listed 50 or more undergraduate courses with two institutions (2 percent) reporting in their catalogs 100 or more home economics courses.

Table XX NUMBER OF HOME ECONOMICS UNDERGRADUATE COURSES LISTED IN CATALOG

Item	Number	Percent
Not recorded or listed	0	0
Less than 10	1	0.9
10-19	14	13.0
20-29	40	37.0
30-39	20	18.5
40-49	11	10.2
50-69	10	9.3
70-99	10	9.3
Over 100	2	1.9
Total	108	100.1

The size of faculty in relation to the number of undergraduate courses listed presented an interesting pattern. The great majority of insitutions with faculties of from 1-6 persons offered 29 or less home economics courses; faculties of from 7-12 persons most frequently offered from 30-49 courses; the great majority of faculties of 21 or more persons offered 50 or more undergraduate home economics courses. See Table III in Appendix A.

Facts about Various Home Economics Majors

Before making an analysis of the semester hour requirements of home economics courses in the various home economics majors, the author will show the frequency of the offering of the various majors themselves. It has been arbitrarily decided that analysis of the home economics semester hour requirements in the various majors will be given for only those majors offered by 20 percent or more of the institutions in this study.

Table XXI FREQUENCY OF DISTRIBUTION OF VARIOUS HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS

Home Economics Majors	Percent of Institutions offering this Major, Fall 1968-69
Home Economics Education	97.2
General Home Economics	61.1
Foods and Nutrition	35.2
Dietetics	28.7
Institution Administration	27.8
Fashion Merchandising	25.0
Clothing and Textiles	22.2
Child Development	14.8
Interior Design	14.8
Child Development and Family Relations	12.0
Housing and Equipment	7.4
Dress Design	6.5
Family Economics and Home Management	6.5
Home Economics Journalism	5.6

From the above table it can be seen that the only two home economics majors offered by 50 percent or more of the institutions in this study were Home Economics Education and General Home Economics. A Foods and Nutrition major was offered more than twice as often as a Child Development major and one-third more often than a Clothing and Textiles major.

These facts are interesting when compared with trends in specialization within home economics as measured by percentage of baccalaureate degrees awarded in the various home economics majors.

> "At the end of the sixties, 1968-69, home economics education continued as the area of specialization at the undergraduate level with the largest percentage of majors. Forty-five percent of all undergraduate degrees granted by units of home economics were in home economics education. The four major areas of study at the undergraduate level with the next largest number of graduates in decreasing order were general home economics (14 percent); textiles, clothing, and merchandising (12 percent); child development and family relationships (11 percent); and foods, nutrition and dietetic (7 percent).

> In 1968-69 the largest percent of master's degrees granted was in home economics education, with 38 percent; at the doctoral level the largest percentage of degrees, 22 percent, was granted in child development and family relationships."[9]

It can be said, therefore, that there is not a direct correlation between the availability of the various home economics majors and the number of graduates produced in the various majors at any degree level.

Home Economics Semester Hours Required in Various Majors

Home Economics Education Major

Three institutions in this study did not offer this major. Of those who did, the largest number 30 (28 percent) required from 41-47 semester hours of home economics courses; about 25 percent required 48-55 semester hours and another nearly 20 percent required from 34-40 semester hours of home economics courses.

Three institutions required from 17-25 semester hours while 3 schools required 71 or more semester hours of home economics courses; the average number of semester hours of home economics courses required of home economics education majors was 42.7.

Table XXII NUMBER OF HOME ECONOMICS HOURS IN THIS MAJOR (H.E. EDUCATION)

	Number	Percent
Not offered this major	3	2.8
16 or less hrs.		
17-25 hrs.	3	2.8
26-33 hrs.	11	10.2
34-40 hrs.	21	19.4
41-47 hrs.	30	27.8
48-55 hrs.	26	24.1
56-70 hrs.	11	10.2
71 or more hours	3	2.8

Table IV in Appendix A shows the distribution of the semester hour requirement of home economics courses in the home economics education major. A summary of averages and the total range within each required subject matter area studied

follows:

Table XXII ANALYSIS OF SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED IN HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION MAJORS

Home Economics Subject	Average Number of Hrs. Required in H. Ec. Educ. Majors*	Total Range of Semester Hrs. Required
Foods	12.6 Sem Hrs.	0-13
Nutrition	5.6	0-13
Clothing	5.9	0-13
Textiles	3.0	0-6
Child Development	4.2	0-10
Family Relations	3.9	0-13
Dress Design	4.8	0-6
Interior Design	2.7	0-6
Housing	2.5	0-6
Equipment	2.4	0-4
Basic Design	3.4	0-13
Family Economics	3.2	0-6
Home Management	4.4	0-10
H.E. Edn. & Stu. Teaching	7.3	0-over 16
H.E. Electives	6.9	0-over 16
Health and Home Nursing	1.9	0-4
Seminar in H. E.	1.9	0-6
Other	2.0	0-6

General Home Economics Major

A total of 42 institutions (39 percent) in this study do not offer a general home economics major. Of those institutions which do, the largest number 18 (17 percent) require from 26-33 semester hours of home economics courses. Fifteen institutions require 48 or more semester hours while 8 institutions require less than 25. The average requirement of home economics courses in this major is 38.6 semester hours. See Table VI in Appendix A.

Dietetics Major

Slightly more than 70 percent of the institutions of this study do no offer a dietetics major. The great majority of those who offer a dietetics major require from 41 to 55 semester hours of home economics

*This average was computed using only those schools which required the subject in their curricula.

courses. See Table VI in Appendix A.

Institution Administration

Only 30 institutions in this study (28 percent) offer an institution administration major. The home economics course requirements in this major are more evenly distributed throughout the various semester hour categories than in most other majors. Four institutions require 17-25 and 26-33 semester hours respectively; 8 institutions require 34-40 and 41-47 semester hours respectively; 6 institutions require more than 48 semester hours of home economics courses. The average home economics courses required in this major is 39 semester hours. See Table VI in Appendix A.

Foods and Nutrition Major

This major is offered by 35 percent of the institutions in this study. Almost equal percentages require 26-33 semester hours, 34-40 semester hours and 41-47 semester hours of home economics courses of a food and nutrition major. Three institutions require less than 25 semester hours while 3 schools require 56-70 semester hours. The average number of home economics courses required for this major was 39.2 semester hours. See Table VI in Appendix A.

Table V in Appendix A shows the distribution of the semester hours requirements of home economics courses in the Food and Nutrition Major. A summary of the averages and the total range required within each home economics subject matter area studied follows:

Table XXIII ANALYSIS OF SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED IN FOODS AND NUTRITION MAJOR

Home Economics Subject	Average Number of Sem. Hrs.* Required in Foods and Nutrition Major	Total Range of Sem. Hrs. Required
Foods	9.2	0-16
Nutrition	8.1	0-16 and over
Clothing	3.1	0-8

*This average was computed using only those schools which required the subject in their curricula.

Table XXIII (Cont.)

Home Economics Subject	Average Number of Sem. Hrs. Required in Foods & Nutrition Major	Total Range of Sem. Hrs. Required
Textiles	2.7	0-4
Child Development	3.5	0-6
Family Relations	3.1	0-6
Institution Administration	6.4	0-over 16
Housing & Equipment	2.8	0-6
Basic Design & Interior Design	2.6	0-4
Family Economics	3.2	0-6
Home Management	4.4	0-8
Other	1.7	0-6

Fashion Merchandising

Exactly one-fourth of the institutions in this study offer a Fashion Merchandising Major. Home Economics courses required in this major vary greatly with almost equal numbers of institutions requiring 26-33 semester hours, 34-40 semester hours, 41-47 semester hours, and 48-55 semester hours respectively. Only 2 institutions required more than 70 semester hours or less than 17 semester hours.

See Table VI in Appendix A for a complete analysis of the distribution of home economics semester hour requirements in the various home economics majors.

Clothing and Textiles Major

Of the 24 institutions offering a Clothing and Textiles Major, 7 require 26-33 and 41-47 semester hours of home economics courses respectively and 5 require 34-40 semester hours. Three institutions require 56-70 semester hours and one institution requires 17-25. Although the range required is from 17-70, the average number of semester hours of home economics courses required of the Clothing and Textiles Major is 40.

Table VI in Appendix A shows the distribution of the semester

hour requirements of home economics courses in the Clothing and Textiles Major. A summary of the averages and the total range required within each home economics subject matter area studied follows:

Table XXIV ANALYSIS OF SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED IN CLOTHING & TEXTILES MAJOR

Home Economics Subject	Average Number of Hrs. Required in Clo. & Tex. Major	Total Range of Sem. Hrs. Req.
Foods	3.3	0-6
Nutrition	2.4	0-4
Clothing	9.7	0-over 16
Textiles	6.9	0-13
Child Development & Family Relations	5.5	0-13
Dress Design	3.3	0-8
Interior Design	3.2	0-8
Housing & Equipment	2.5	0-6
Basic Design	3.1	0-4 over 16
Family Economics	3.5	0-6
Home Management	3.9	0-8
H. E. Electives	8.5	0-over 16
Health	1.9	0-4
Fashion Merchandising		
Other	1.6	0-4

Number of Different Majors, By Type of Institution

From the table below it can be seen that significantly more state and denominational institutions offered two or less majors than other types of institutions. Nearly 90 percent or more of denominational, private and municipal institutions offered 4 or less majors. A very substantial percentage (49.9 percent) of land-grant institutions offered more than 9 different majors.

Although a significant number of state institutions (36.8 percent) offered two or less majors, slightly more than one-third offered 5 or more different majors. This compares with 57 percent of land-grant institutions in that category. It can be said, therefore, that the great majority of institutions offering a large number of different majors are state and land-grant institutions.

Table XXV NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF MAJORS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONS

Institutions	Number of Different Majors							
	2 or less		3 or 4		5 to 8		More than 9	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State	21	36.8	16	28	17	29.8	3	5.3
Land-grant	2	14.3	4	28.6	1	7.1	7	49.9
Denominational	8	47.1	7	41.2	1	5.9	1	5.9
Private	5	27.8	11	61.1	1	5.6	1	5.6
Municipal	0	0	2	100.0	0	0	0	0

Number of Types of Home Economics Majors Offered, By Size of Faculty

It would seem from Table XXVI below that more than 95 percent of the institutions with faculties in the ranges of 1-3 and 4-6 persons offer four or less different types of majors. The fact that two-thirds of the institutions with the smallest faculties (1-3 persons) offered two or less majors is not surprising; the fact that one-third of this group offered from 3-8 majors is, perhaps, quite surprising.

When faculty size was composed of from 7 to 20 persons, the great majority of institutions in these categories offered from 3 to 8 different majors. Until the size of faculty reached 21 or more persons, there were not significant numbers of institutions which offered 9 or more majors.

With the exception of the large faculties (21 or more persons) one-half or more institutions in all categories of faculty size offered 4 or less majors.

Table XXVI DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF TYPES OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS OFFERED, BY SIZE OF HOME ECONOMICS FACULTY

Size of Staff	Number of Types of Majors Offered				
	1-2	3-4	5-8	9-12	More than 12
1-3 #	18	8	1	0	0
%	66.6	29.6	3.7	0.0	0.0
4-6 #	11	14	1	0	0
%	42.3	53.9	3.8	0.0	0.0
7-12 #	3	11	9	0	0
%	13.0	47.8	39.1	0.0	0.0
13-20 #	2	7	6	2	0
%	11.8	41.1	35.3	11.7	0.0
21-or #	1	0	3	6	4
More . %	7.1	0.0	21.4	42.8	28.7

Distribution of Total Semester Hours Required for Graduation of Home Economics Majors, Fall 1968-69

The General Education Requirements of Home Economics Majors

An analysis of the distribution of general education courses required of all home economics majors has been made from Table VII in Appendix A and is summarized as follows:

Table XXVII SUMMARY OF GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS, FALL 1968-69

Subjects	Average Semester Hours Required	Range for Semester Hours Required
Communication Skills English; Speech	13.5	0-29
Social Studies History, Econ., Geography, Pol. Sci., Psych., Soc.	14.4	4-20
Natural Science Biological and Physical	13.3	4-29

Table XXVII (Cont.)

Subjects	Average Semester Hours Required	Range for Semester Hours Required
Humanities Art, Music, Phil. Th. Arts, For. Lang.	12.1	0-30 or more
Physical Education & Health	5.9	0-15
Mathematics	5.9	0-11

Although the range of semester hours required of home economics majors in general education courses was quite wide, there was a close similarity in averages required in the various subject matter disciplines. This latter fact might be considered surprising in view of the diversity of types and sizes of institutions and their home economics programs included in this study.

When the general education requirements of the home economics majors degree programs were assessed in relation to the total hours required for graduation, the following facts seemed pertinent.

The largest number of institutions 31 (28.7 percent) require from 36-40 percent of the total hours required for graduation in general education courses. About equal numbers of institutions require 31-35 percent and 41-45 percent respectively. The average number of semester hours of general education requirements was 40.1 percent of the total hours required for graduation. See Table XXVIII below for complete information.

Table XXVIII DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS IN RELATION TO TOTAL HOURS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION, FALL 1968-69

Item	Number of Institutions	Percent
No requirement	5	4.6
30% or less	12	11.1
31-35%	19	17.6
36-40%	31	28.7
41-45%	17	15.7
46-50%	16	14.8
51-55%	7	6.5
56-60%	1	0.9
61-70%	0	0
71% or more of total hours	0	0
Total	108	99.9

An analysis was made of the semester hours required in each individual subject included as a part of the general education requirements of home economics majors. The facts are summarized in Table XXIX below.

Table XXIX SUMMARY OF SEMESTER HOURS OF GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIRED IN THE HOME ECONOMICS MAJOR, FALL 1968-69

Subject	Average Semester Hrs. Required of All H. E. Majors	Range of S. H. Required of H. E. Majors
Anthropology	3.3	0-4
Art	3.5	0-8
Bacteriology	3.5	0-4
Bible	5.9	0-12
Biology	4.8	0-10
Chemistry	5.5	0-15 or more
Drama	Less than 3	0-2
Economics	3.6	0-6
English	7.2	0-15 or more
English/Lit.	4.2	0-10
Foreign Language	8.0	0-15 or more
Government	3.7	0-6
Health	2.7	Less than 3-12
History	4.8	0-14
Music	2.8	0-4
Philosophy	5.5	0-15 or more

Table XXIX (Cont.)

Subject	Average Semester Hrs. Required of All H.E. Majors	Range of S.H. Required of H.E. Majors
Physical Education	3.1	0-8
Physical Science	3.7	0-6
Physics	3.4	0-6
Physiology	3.4	0-15 or more
Political Science	3.3	0-8
Psychology	3.7	0-10
Sociology	3.8	0-15 or more
Theology	8.4	0-15 or more
Zoology	3.6	0-6

Since the value of this information would come primarily from being able to compare a specific home economics program with these figures, the author feels it unnecessary to make further comment. For complete information regarding the semester hour requirements of home economics majors in general education, see Table VIII in Appendix A.

The Professional Education Requirements of Home Economics Majors

The distribution of professional education requirements in relation to the total hours required for graduation for home economics majors was studied. Courses listed under this category were those designed especially for the professional preparation of the major, i.e., education courses, accounting for the dietetics major, personnel management for the Institution Management Major, Developmental Psychology for the Child Development Major, and so forth.

From Table XXX below it can be seen that the range of hours required varied from zero semester hours to about one-third of the total hours required for graduation. The largest number of institutions in this study (21.3 percent) required from 13-16 percent professional education requirements. The average requirement of courses in this category was 13.2 percent of total hours required for graduation.

Table XXX DISTRIBUTION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS IN RELATION TO TOTAL HOURS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION, FALL 1968-69

	Number	Percent
No requirement	13	12.0
Less than 5% of total hours required	8	7.4
5-8%	17	15.9
9-12%	19	17.6
13-16%	23	21.3
17-20%	16	14.8
21-24%	6	5.6
25-28%	4	3.7
29 or more % of total hours	2	1.9
Total	108	100.2

Home Economics Requirements in Relation to Total Hours Required for Graduation

Home economics course requirements varied more than 400 percent; one institution required from 11-15 percent of the total hours required for graduation while 5 institutions required 46-50 or more percent. The largest number of institutions (25.9 percent) required from 26-30 percent of the total hours for graduation in home economics while the average requirement for all institutions was 34.6 percent of the total hours required for graduation. See Table XXXI below.

Table XXXI DISTRIBUTION OF HOME ECONOMICS REQUIREMENTS OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS IN RELATION TO TOTAL HOURS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION, FALL 1968-69

Item	Number	Percent
No requirement of this	0	0.0
10% or less of total hours	0	0.0
11-15%	1	0.9
16-20%	7	6.5
21-25%	15	13.9
26-30%	28	25.9
31-35%	27	25.0
36-40%	14	13.0
41-45%	11	10.2
46-50% of total hours (or more)	5	4.6
Total	108	100.0

Electives in the Home Economics Majors

In studying the catalogs, nearly 10 percent of the institutions in this study made no mention of electives in their home economics program listings. Of those who revealed elective credit, the number of semester hours ranged from 1-3 percent to over 24 percent of the total hours required for graduation. About one-third of the institutions 34 (31.4 percent) offered from 7-12 percent elective credit. The average percent of total hours required for graduation of elective credit in the curricula studied was 10.99 percent of total hours required for graduation. See Table XXXII below.

Table XXXII DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTIVES OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS IN RELATION TO TOTAL HOURS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION, FALL 1968-69

	Number	Percent
No mention	10	9.3
1-3% of total hours	11	10.2
4-6%	17	15.7
7-9%	17	15.7
10-12%	15	13.9
13-15%	9	8.3
16-18%	11	10.2
19-21%	11	10.2
22-24%	2	1.9
Over 24% of total hours	4	4.6
Total	107	100.0

The fact that slightly more than 50 percent of the institutions in this study permitted less than 10 percent of their total hours required for graduation to consist of electives would suggest that a majority of home economics programs are very tightly (too, tightly perhaps) prescribed. This might mean students would have less than one course per year of "free elective" choice in their 4-year undergraduate program.

It is interesting to compare the minimum academic requirements proposed by the 1963-64 AHEA Accreditation Committee as published in the Journal of Home Economics[10] with the data collected in this study. Although the present Criteria and Guidelines to be used as the standard for accrediting college home economics programs do not contain a specific formula for the percentage distribution of course work, the 1964 report represents the latest published opinion of home economics leaders (available to the author) on that subject.

It was suggested that a minimum of 28 percent of the total credits required for graduation be divided equally among: (1) humanities, (2) social studies, and (3) natural science.[11] From Table XXVII p.29 it can be seen that the "average semester hours required" in these disciplines was well to the right of that figure. From Table VII in Appendix A, it can be seen that very few institutions required fewer semester hours in these subjects than the Committee was suggesting. Concomitantly, it is obvious that the great majority of institutions (85 percent) in this study had requirements well above the minimum set by our 1964 AHEA Accreditation Committee.

It was also suggested that 20 percent of the total credits required for graduation would be in home economics courses. As can be seen from Table XXXI p. 32, not more than 7 percent of the institutions in this study would have failed to meet that standard. Contrariwise, 93 percent of the institutions would have more than met this criteria.

The Accreditation Committee, recommended that 22 percent of the total credits required for graduation should be in professional course work. This was defined as, "those courses specifically designed for professional preparation, specialization in one of the subject matter areas, or additional work in the root disciplines which contribute to the specialization."[12]

From Table XXX on p.32 it can be seen that 6 institutions (5.6 percent) in this study met that requirement exactly with another 6 percent exceeding the requirement. Therefore, 96 institutions (89 percent) required 20 percent or less of the total hours for graduation in professional education courses. From this it seems feasible to suggest that a great number of home economic units re-examine their present professional education requirements. We need to make sure that our programs are providing adequate training for entry-level work in the various career areas for which we purport to train professional workers.

Elective credit in the AHEA Accreditation Committee's recommended minimum academic requirements list totalled 30 percent of the total curriculum requirements. As can be seen from Table XXXII on p.33, actual practice among the institutions in this study is quite out-of-line to the left to this proposal; most institutions permit less than 10 percent of the total hours required for graduation to be elective credit.

It is the opinion of the author that present day students should be given (yes, are demanding) more flexibility in the choice of their college courses than this study would suggest that most home economics programs are allowing. It would seem feasible to the author, based on research in the theories of learning and on established principles of behavioral psychology, that tightly prescribed home economics programs could be effectively "loosened up" by two major methods. In the first place, the student could be given the option of selecting courses from within a widely based grouping of courses in the root disciplines. An example to illustrate this is taken from the humanities requirement for all professional degrees awarded by Eastern Illinois University as follows:[13] "Humanities - 16-20 quarter hours." Option I: twelve quarter hours in foreign language,

plus 8 hours in art, dance, literature, music, philosophy, speech, theatre arts. Option II: A total of 16 quarter hours in more than one of these subjects: art, dance, literature, music, philosophy, speech, theatre arts." This kind of choice enables students to select courses which meet their interests, goals, and abilities within a loosely prescribed framework of general education courses. This same principle could apply, in many cases, to natural science and social science requirements.

A second way to provide more flexibility in course selection for individual students is to permit selection of home economics courses from a grouping of "restricted electives". This gives students the feeling of having their individual needs more nearly met while it concomitantly permits home economic educators to have control of the various programs offered.

Total Semester Hours Required of Home Economics Majors for Graduation, Fall, 1968-69.

In computing the total hours required for graduation, an average from among all of the several types of home economics majors offered within a given institution was computed and used to compile Table XXXIII below.

Table XXXIII TOTAL SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS FOR GRADUATION, FALL 1968-69.

Item	Number	Per Cent
Less than 120 sem. hrs.		
120-122 sh.	13	12.0
123-124 sh.	14	13.0
125-126 sh.	6	5.6
127-128 sh.	29	26.9
129-130 sh.	19	17.6
131-132 sh.	13	12.0
133-134 sh.	7	6.5
Over 135 sh. or 135 sh.	7	6.5

These data show that there is a 12.2 percent difference between the lowest and highest semester hour requirement for graduation in home economics programs.

The largest number of institutions 29 (26.9 percent) require 127-28 semester hours for graduation; 75 percent of all institutions require 130 semester hours or less while 25 percent require 131 or more semester hours. The average number of semester hours required for home economics graduates was 127.8.

General Education Requirements by Type of Institutions, Fall 1968-69

When the general education requirements were analyzed by the type of institution, the following facts emerged: (See Table IX in Appendix A)

Distribution of Institutions Requiring 40 Percent or more of Curriculum in General Education.

More than 80 percent of both denominational and private institutions (82 and 84 respectively) required more than 40 percent of their total hours required for graduation in general education courses.

61.4 percent of state universities required 40 percent or more of their total hours for graduation in general education courses.

50 percent of land-grant institutions followed the pattern described in 1 and 2 above.

Most Common Percentage Distribution of General Education Requirements, by Type of Institution.

20 (35.1 percent) of state institutions required from 41-45 percent of their total hours in general education courses.

6 (43 percent) of land-grant institutions required 41-45 percent of their total hours in general education courses.

7 (41.1 percent) of denominational institutions required 51-55 percent of their total hours in general education courses.

5 (28 percent) of private institutions required 46-50 percent and 51-55 percent respectively of their total hours in general education courses.

1 (50 percent) municipal institution required 36-40 percent and one

(50 percent) required 41-45 percent of their total hours in general education courses.

Professional Education Requirements, by Type of Institution, Fall 1968-69.

When the professional education requirements were analyzed by the type of institution, it can be seen that: (See Table X in Appendix A)

Distribution of Institutions Requiring 21 percent or more of Curriculum in Professional Education Courses.

7 (12 percent) of state institutions did this.

2 (14 percent) of landgrant institutions did this.

2 (12 percent) of denominational institutions did this.

1 (6 percent) of private schools did this.

Neither of the two municipal institutions in this study did this.

Therefore, only small percentages of institutions from any category met the minimum standards for professional education courses as recommended by the AHEA Accreditation Committee of 1963-64. (The reader is reminded that these standards were not adopted in the present standards for AHEA accreditation.) It is recommended by the author, however, that home economics faculties re-examine their professional education requirements to insure that home economics majors are not being short-changed in their pre-professional preparation for entrance into their chosen fields.

Most common percentage distribution of professional education requirements, by type of institution.

15 (26 percent) of state institutions require 13-16 percent.

4 (29 percent) of land-grant institutions require less than 5 percent.

4 (24 percent) of denominational schools require 9-12 percent and 17-20 percent respectively.

4 (22 percent) of private schools require 5-8 percent.

One municipal school required 9-12 percent; the other one required 13-16 percent.

There was not a common pattern of professional education requirements discernible from these figures when analyzed by the type of institution. As stated earlier, however, the largest number of all institutions included in this study required 13-16 percent of the total hours required for graduation in professional education courses.

Home Economics Requirements by Type of Institution, Fall 1968-69.

Distribution of Institutions Requiring 21 Percent or More of Curriculum in Home Economics Courses. (See Table XI in Appendix A.)

95 percent of all state institutions did this.

86 percent of all land-grant institutions did this.

94 percent of all denominational institutions did this.

89 percent of all private institutions did this.

100 percent of all municipal institutions did this.

The great majority of institutions in all categories would have met the minimum standards as recommended by the 1963-64 AHEA Accreditation Committee. Those institutions requiring 41 percent or more of home economics courses were as follows:

State - 21 percent
Land-grant - 7 percent
Denominational - 0 percent
Private - 11 percent
Municipal - 50 percent

Most Common Percentage Distribution of Home Economics Courses Required, by Type of Institution.

15 (26 percent) of state institutions required 26-30 percent.
15 (26 percent) of state institutions required 31-35 percent.

6 (43 percent) of land grant institutions required 31-35 percent.

8 (47 percent) of denominational institutions required 26-30 percent.

5 (28 percent) of private institutions required 21-25 percent.

Both municipal institutions (100 percent) required above 31 percent.

Fifteen percent of all institutions in this study required 41 percent or more of their total hours for graduation in home economics courses; approximately three-fourths of these were state institutions.

Electives Required by the Type of Institution, Fall 1968-69.

Distribution of institutions requiring 19 percent or more of curriculum in elective credit. (See Table XII in Appendix A)

5 (9 percent) of state institutions did this.

6 (43 percent) of land-grant institutions did this.

2 (12 percent) of denominational institutions did this.

5 (28 percent) of private institutions did this.

Neither municipal institution did this.

A much larger percentage of land-grant than other institutions permit 19 percent or more of elective credits in the home economics curricula. All institutions, including land-grant, failed to meet the 30 percent minimum of elective credit recommended by the 1963-64 AHEA Accreditation Committee. Faculties should re-examine their tight prescriptions in light of present day trends and demands of students.

Total Semester Hours Required for Graduation, by Type of Institution, Fall 1968-69.

The largest number of institutions (26.9 percent) required from 127-128 sem. hrs. while the second largest number (17.6 percent) required from 129-130 sem.hrs. for graduation.

The largest number of state institutions (23 percent) required from

127-128 sem. hrs. while another 21 percent required 129-130 sem. hrs. Nearly one-third of the state institutions required less than 127 sem. hrs. for graduation while nearly one-fourth required more than 130.

43 percent of land-grant institutions required fewer than 127-128 sem. hrs. while 21 percent required more than 130 sem hrs.

24 percent of denominational institutions required fewer than 127-128 sem. hrs. while 29 percent required more than 130 sem. hrs.

22 percent of private institutions required fewer than 127-128 sem. hrs. while 28 percent required more than 130 sem. hrs.

One municipal institution required 123-124 sem. hrs.; the other municipal institution required 127-128 sem. hrs.

From this it can be seen that more land-grant than other institutions required fewer than 127 semester hours for graduation than any other type, while a larger percentage of denominational than other institutions required more than 130 semester hours for graduation.

See Table XIII in Appendix A for complete data.

Home Economics Core Requirements

Incidence of Core Requirements

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (63.0 percent) required certain specific home economics courses of all majors. Forty institutions, representing 37 percent of all respondents, did not require a core. See Table XXXIV below.

Table XXXIV. DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS OFFERING A HOME ECONOMICS CORE

Respondents Offering a Home Economics Core	Number	Percentage
Yes, they do	27	25.0
No, they don't	40	37.0
In effect, yes - list hours required of all home economics majors	41	38.0
Totals	108	100.0

Characteristics of Home Economics Core Requirements of All Majors

Semester Hour Requirements

Slightly less than half (44 percent) of the respondents report that there are no core requirements in their home economics programs. Of those requiring a core of all home economics majors, the largest number of institutions (15 percent) required 21-25 semester hours; the range of hours required was from less than 10 to more than 40 semester hours. See Table XXXV below.

Table XXXV RESPONDENTS' SEMESTER HOUR REQUIREMENTS IN THE CORE REQUIRED OF ALL MAJORS AT INSTITUTION

Item	Semester Hour Requirements in the Core									
	None	Less Than 10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	More Than 40	Totals
Number	44	10	9	10	16	6	7	5	1	108
Percent	40.7	9.3	8.3	9.3	14.8	5.6	6.5	4.6	0.9	100.0

Home Economics Core, by Type of Institution

A home economics core was required by a much larger percentage of state, denominational, and municipal institutions than by private or land-grant (68, 71, and 100 percent versus 44 and 50 percent respectively). One-half of all land-grant and 44 percent of private institutions required a core. See Table XXXVI below.

Table XXXVI. HOME ECONOMICS CORE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Item	Type of Institution									
	State		Land-grant		Denominational		Private		Municipal	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	39	68.4	7	50	12	70.6	8	44.4	2	100
No	18	31.6	7	50	5	29.4	10	55.6	0	0

Number of Hours in the Home Economics Core, by Type of Institution

With the exception of municipal institutions, there was a remarkable similarity in average number of semester hours required in the core of home economics courses by type of institution - the range varied only 4 sem. hrs.

A second similarity was that approximately 50 percent of the institutions in each category, except municipal, required 20 or less semester hours and 50 percent required 21 or more semester hours in the home economics core. See Table XXXVII below.

Table XXXVII NUMBER OF HOURS IN HOME ECONOMICS CORE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Type of Institution	Hours Required in the Core									
	10 or Less		20 or Less		21-30		31-40		Average No. of Hours	Totals
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
State	5	13.5	11	29.7	15	40.5	6	16.2	20.9	37 100
Land-grant	0	0.0	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0.0	19.3	7 100
Denominational	2	20.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	4	40.0	22.0	10 100
Private	3	37.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	17.5	8 100
Municipal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	35.0	2 100

Subject Matter Distribution of Home Economics Core Course Requirements

About half of all respondents requiring a home economics core require courses in F&N, C&T, and CD & FR. The maximum hours required by an institution in these areas of subject matter was 13 semester hours. With the exception of courses in F&N, the average requirement for core courses was 3-6 semester hours. This was also true for requirements in Housing, Equipment and Interior Design, Related Arts, and Home Management. The average for F&N was about 7 semester hours. For a more complete analysis of home economics subject matter core requirements, see Table XIV in Appendix A.

Home Economics Minors

Information regarding minors offered by the schools in this study was obtained from two sources: (1) from college catalogs and (2) from a questionnaire submitted to the home economics administrator.

Slightly more than half of the schools in this study offered no minors of any type (51.9 percent). Of those offering minors, the great majority offered only one minor; one school offered as many as 8 minors. See Table below.

Table XXXVIII NUMBER OF MINORS OFFERED

Item	Number	Percent
No minors offered	56	51.9
1 minor offered	41	38.0
2 minors offered	3	2.8
3 minors offered	4	3.7
4 minors offered	1	0.9
5 minors offered	2	1.9
6 minors offered		
7 minors offered		
8 minors offered	1	0.9
9 minors offered		
Total	108	100.1

When administrators were asked if they made an effort to recruit more home economics minors, slightly less than half responded that they did do this. Slightly more than half (54 percent) either did not answer the question or gave a "no" answer. Some comments of the administrators regarding this question showed that the two most commonly held reasons for offering minors are as follows, in ranked order:

1. Home Economics elective (or a minor) is good for the general education of women.

2. Students minoring in home economics often change to majors; therefore, the minor is a good thing to have.

Three administrators mentioned the fact that they did not have time to offer minors in their program.

From Table XXXIX it can be quickly seen that a general home economics minor is four times as popular as its next competitor--home economics education. A very small percentage of schools offer minors in F & N, clothing and textiles, child developement, and family relationships.

Table XXXIX TYPES OF MINORS OFFERED IN THE HOME ECONOMICS UNITS

Type of Minor	Offered		Not Offered		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
General Home Ec	42	38.9	66	61.1	108	100
Foods & Nutrition	5	4.6	103	95.4	108	100
Clothing & Textiles	7	6.5	101	93.5	108	100
Child Development	4	3.7	104	96.3	108	100
Family Relations	5	4.6	103	95.4	108	100
Home Ec Education	10	9.3	98	90.7	108	100
Other H.Ec. Minors	4	3.7	104	96.3	108	100

The semester hour requirements of minors included in this study may be seen in Table XV in Appendix A.

Five schools offered minors composed of 12 or less semester hours while the maximum number of hours required was from 28-32 with only two schools reporting minors in this category. Nearly half of all schools offering minors required 19-22 semester hours for the minor.

Size of Home Economics Course Enrollments, Fall 1968-69

Home economics administrators were asked to list the number of students in their largest, smallest, and average class (both lecture and laboratory); about 75 percent responded. Data will be considered by type of class.

Lecture Classes

Largest Lecture Class Enrollments

Of those who responded to this item the following facts

seem pertinent: 4 percent had enrollments in lecture classes with 20 or fewer students and 6 percent had more than 150 students. The class size with the greatest frequency when considering all respondents was from 51-70 students. About one-third of all classes ranged from 41 to 100 students in size.

When largest class size was considered by type of institution, both land-grant and state schools had a larger number of classes in the 51-70 student range than any other; the range of 41-50 was most popular for denominational schools and 31-40 for private institutions. Neither of the two municipal institutions in the study revealed their class size figures.

Land-grant and state institutions each had about 20 percent of their classes in the range of 101 or more students per class.

When compared to other disciplines, home economics classes are still relatively small. Many classes in such subjects as art, history, music appreciation, introductory psychology, and the like, have from 500 to 1000 students per class section.

For further information, see Table XVI in Appendix A.

Average Lecture Class Enrollment

Respondents were asked to give an "average lecture enrollment" of students. For all institutions, the greatest frequency was in the 16-20 students per class category; the second greatest frequency was in the 26-30 group. When considered by type of institution, state and land-grant institutions most frequently reported their average lecture class to have 26-30 students; denominational and private schools reported 16-20 as their average lecture class enrollment. It would be expected that

state and land-grant schools would have larger class sections in terms of enrollment because, in general, they have more home economics majors to service. See Table XVII in Appendix A.

Smallest Lecture Class Enrollments See Table XVIII in Appendix A

For all institutions, 19 percent had classes with less than 5 persons; 43 percent had classes ranging from 5-10 persons; 15 percent reported their smallest lecture class enrollments to be 11-16. No institution reported their smallest class to be in the range of 17 or more.

Smallest Lecture Enrollment, By Type of Institution

Less than 20 percent of all institutions in this study had classes of less than five persons, denominational (24 percent) and private (33 percent) schools had the highest percentages of classes in this category.

All schools reported relatively high percentages (39 to 47 percent) of classes in the range of from 5-10 students. Much smaller percentages of schools (0-23 percent) reported their smallest lecture enrollment as being from 11-16 students. See Table below.

Table XL SMALLEST LECTURE ENROLLMENTS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Schools	Smallest Lecture Enrollments, by Type of Institution									
	4 or less		5-10		11-16		No answer		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State	8	14.1	25	43.9	13	22.8	11	19.3	57	100.0
Land-grant	2	14.3	6	42.9	2	14.2	4	28.6	14	100.0
Denominational	4	23.6	8	47.0	0	0	5	29.4	17	100.0
Private	6	33.4	7	39.0	1	5.6	4	22.2	18	100.2
Municipal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	100.0
Total Groups	20	18.5	46	42.6	16	14.8	26	24.1	108	100.0

Smallest Lecture Class Enrollment, By Type of Administration

About one-fourth of all home economics units in autonomous, natural science and agriculture units had lecture classes ranging from 0-4 persons.

With the exception of natural science, all administrative units reported classes ranging from 5 to 10 students as their smallest lecture class.

Small percentages of autonomous, applied arts, and agriculture units reported 14-16 persons as their smallest class lecture enrollment. See Table XIX in Appendix A.

Table XLI SMALLEST LECTURE ENROLLMENTS, BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATION

Students in Class	Autonomous		Education Unit		Fine and/or Professional Arts		Applied Art or Science		Social Science		Natural Science		Not Indicated or other		Agriculture	
0-4	7	21	1	8	0	0	4	19	0	0	2	29	5	25	1	25
5-10	14	43	7	58	3	50	9	43	2	50	2	29	7	33	2	50
More than 11	6	18	1	8	3	50	3	14	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	25

Laboratory Class Enrollments

Nearly 40 percent of the respondents in this study did not answer this item. Of those who did, it is interesting to note that no schools reported laboratory classes with less than 10 students. Only 6 percent of the respondents reported lab sections with 15 or fewer students while 5 percent reported labs with 41 or more students. For both state and land-grant schools the largest frequencies (21 percent of all sections) fell in the 16-

20 student lab-class size. A significant number of lab sections in state schools (33 percent) were larger than 25 students per section; 21 percent of land-grant schools reported lab sections of this size.

The average lab class size in denominational and private schools was in the 11 to 20 student size range. Neither of the municipal administrators answered this item.

See Table XX in Appendix A.

Largest Laboratory Enrollments

The range of largest laboratory enrollments was 11-51 or more. The average lab size was 21-25 students. Highest percentages of large lab enrollments were in state and land-grant institutions. One denominational school reported lab enrollments in the range of 41-50 students. See Table XXI in Appendix A

Average Laboratory Enrollments

The range of average sized lab enrollments was 6 to more than 31 students with the average for all institutions being 19-21 students. State and land-grant institutions had larger percentages of lab sections above the average for all institutions. See Table XXI in Appendix A.

Smallest Laboratory Enrollments

There were 12 percent of the institutions which had laboratories with fewer than 5 students; small enrollments ranged from 1 to more than 16 students. See Table XXII in Appendix A.

Preparation of Generalists Versus Specialists in Home Economics

Respondents were asked to indicate, in their opinion, whether or not they prepare undergraduates primarily as "generalists" or "specialists". The majority of respondents (58 percent) said "yes" they were primarily

preparing generalists, 25 percent said that they were, in their opinion, preparing primarily "specialists". The remaining respondents either did not answer the item or were in the "not sure" category.

Many readers will recall the McGrath Report conclusion on this matter.

> "...some specialized majors (in home economics) must be provided, but the present need in undergraduate programs is to assure the quality of the broad major in the field - the major most appropriate for students who seek employment as home economists in business or as school teachers of home economics, or for those who enroll to become more effective community, volunteer workers or better homemakers. Such a broad curriculum for the generalist appears in danger of being relegated to secondary concern behind the specialized curricula. Yet, in terms of numbers at least, it is the most important of all." [14]

See Table XLII below.

Table XLII PREPARATION OF GENERALISTS VERSUS SPECIALISTS IN HOME ECONOMICS

Respondents Opinion	Prepare Generalists				Prepare Specialists				
	No Answer	Yes	No	Not Sure	No Answer	Yes	No	Not Sure	
Total #	22	63	17	6	22	27	50	9	
Group %	20.4	58.3	15.7	5.6	20.4	25.0	46.3	8.3	

RECENT CHANGES IN HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULA

Administrators were asked whether within the past 3 to 5 years they had made any changes in curricula or majors by adding new programs or dropping old ones. The great majority of respondents (67 percent) answered "no". Of the 12 percent that answered "yes", 62 percent were from state, 15 percent from land-grant, 15 percent denominational, and 8 percent from private schools. It would seem from this that state institutions, more than any other, have been making changes in curricula. One reason for this, it might be postulated, is that many state colleges have grown in recent years into universities and with this growth there has come a change in emphasis of programs and a concomitant change in offerings. See Table below.

Table XLIII RECENT CHANGES IN HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULA

Item	Type of Institution											
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	8	14.0	2	14.3	2	11.8	1	5.6	0	0.0	13	12.0
No	43	75.4	8	57.1	12	70.6	14	77.8	2	100.0	72	66.7
No Mention	6	10.5	4	28.6	3	17.6	3	16.7	0	0.0	16	14.8

ADDED HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULAR OFFERINGS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Forty-two percent of all institutions responding have added new curricular offerings within the past three to five years. Of that number, 64 percent were added to home economics programs of state, 13 percent were added in land-grant, 11 percent in denominational, and 9 percent to private institutions. One of the two municipal institutions has added a new program or offerings within this span.

Exactly the same number of institutions 45 (42 percent) said that they have not added new curricular offerings or programs within the past three to five years. Nearly half of the schools in this category were state, 20 percent were denominational, 24 percent were private, and 7 percent were land-grant institutions.

This data adds support to the fact that a larger number of state universities than other schools have added new programs while concomitantly showing that only about half of all the state schools responding have made curricular changes. See Table below.

Table XLIV ADDED HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULAR OFFERINGS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Item	Type of Institution											
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	29	50.9	6	42.9	5	29.4	4	22.2	1	50.0	45	41.7
No	21	36.8	3	21.4	9	52.9	11	61.1	1	50.0	45	41.7
No Mention	7	12.3	5	35.7	3	17.6	3	16.7	0	0.0	18	16.8

DESIGNING SPECIAL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS FOR "OLDER" UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Administrators were asked to respond to the question, "In your opinion should home economics in higher education design special programs for the 'older' undergraduate student?"

When administrators' replies for "no answer", "no", and "not sure" were combinded, it represented the opinions of 73 (68 percent) of all administrators in this study. Of those 35 administrators who answered "yes", 21 (60 percent) were from state, 7 (20 percent) were from denominational, 5 (14 percent) were from land-grant and 2 (6 percent) were from private institutions.

Without knowing, the author would speculate that more administrators of state institutions have been faced with the problems of the returning older student than other types of institutions offering home economics programs. State institutions are usually strategically placed geographically within the state so that large numbers of the population have a university accessible to them. It would seem reasonable to suggest that because of this, larger numbers of older students have applied for admission to state schools and thus home economics administrators have been faced with meeting their special needs for home economics courses.

In any event, it would seem that administrators in general do not feel that special programs for the older student should be designed and implemented.

In the opinion of the author, institutions of higher education do not need to design special home economics programs for the older students nearly as much as they need to re-examine the criteria for admitting the

the older students and for meeting their special needs in terms of residence requirements, physical education requirements and the like once they have been admitted. Regretfully this study did not cover this aspect of the problem. See Table below.

TABLE XLV OFFERING PROGRAMS FOR OLDER UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	21	36.8	5	35.7	7	41.2	2	11.1	0	0.0	35	32.4
No	14	24.6	3	21.4	2	11.8	5	27.8	2	100.0	26	24.1
No Answer	22	38.6	6	42.9	8	47.0	11	61.1	0	0.0	47	43.5

DESIGN REFRESHER COURSES FOR THE "OUT-OF-DATE" HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES

More than two-thirds of the home economics administrators in this study responded that, in their opinion, home economics in higher education should design refresher courses especially for the out-of-date graduates. Slightly more than half (54 percent) of those with this opinion were from state institutions; 18 and 16 percent were from denominational and private schools respectively; 11 percent were from land-grant institutions and one of the two administrators from municipal universities was in this category.

It is interesting to note that no administrators from private or denominational institutions voted "no" on this question; 100 percent of the "no" opinions were from state and land-grant insitutions. It might have been postulated that small school home economics administrators would feel it desirable for some institutions to design special refresher courses for the out-of-date graduates. Administrators of small departments could often make use of home economics graduates in the community if only they were up-to-date in their subject matter specialty.

It could also have been postulated that administrators from the larger

state and land-grant schools might feel that it is hard to get approval for special courses, to man them with their regular staffs and to find adequate budget for such an idea. This was not proven true among these respondents; 70 percent of all state administrators and 57 percent of all land-grant administrators felt that this should be done.

TABLE XLVI DESIGN REFRESHER COURSES FOR "OUT-OF-DATE" HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	40	70.2	8	57.1	13	76.5	12	66.7	1	50.0	74	68.5
No	6	10.5	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	6.5
No Answer	11	19.3	5	35.7	4	23.5	6	33.4	1	50.0	27	25.0

Acceptance of Educational Television Courses for Credit

Respondents were asked whether or not within the past 3-5 years their institution would accept educational television courses for credit to meet undergraduate or graduate degree requirements.

Undergraduate Credit

About two-thirds of all respondents either did not respond to this question or responded with a "no". Of the 40 (37 percent) "yes" responses, 48 percent were from state, 20 percent were from denominational, 18 percent from private, and 13 percent from land-grant institutions. One of the two municipal university administrators made a "yes" response. See Table below.

TABLE XLVIII EDUCATIONAL TV COURSES FOR CREDIT, UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	19	33.3	5	35.7	8	47.1	7	38.9	1	50.0	40	37.0
No	30	52.6	4	28.6	6	35.3	5	27.8	1	50.0	46	42.6
No Mention	8	14.0	5	35.7	3	17.6	6	33.3	0	0.0	22	20.4

Graduate Credit.

Less than 10 percent of the respondents said their institution would accept educational television courses for credit at the graduate level. Of these, 30 percent were from state, 40 percent from land-grant, 20 percent from private, and 10 percent from municipal institutions. No denominational schools reported acceptance of graduate educational television courses for credit.

When the "did not mention" responses were added to the "no" responses, 91 percent of all respondents were in these categories. It is obvious, therefore, that there is a very limited use of educational television in offering graduate courses for credit. Also, four times as many schools give credit for educational television at the undergraduate than at the graduate level. See Table below.

Table XLVIII EDUCATIONAL TV COURSES FOR GRADUATE CREDIT, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution										108
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	# %
Yes	3	5.3	4	28.6	0	0.0	2	11.1	1	50.0-	10-9.3
No	44	77.2	5	35.7	9	52.9	5	27.8	1	50.0	64-59.4
No Mention	10	17.5	5	35.7	8	47.1	11	61.1	0	0.0	34-31.5

Correspondence Courses Accepted for Undergraduate and Graduate Credit

When respondents were asked whether or not their institution would accept correspondence courses for credit to meet degree requirements, the following answers were given.

Undergraduate Credit

Exactly two-thirds of the respondents answered "yes" that their institutions do accept correspondence courses for credit to meet undergraduate degree requirements. Of this number of institutions, 56 per-

cent were from state, 17 percent were from denominational, 16 percent were from private, 10 percent were from land-grant, and 2 percent were from municipal institutions.

Of the 17 respondents (16 percent) who answered the questions with "no", 59 percent were from state, 12 percent from land-grant, 12 percent from denominational, 12 percent from private, and 6 percent were from municipal institutions. The remaining 20 respondents (19 percent) did not answer this question.

It would seem fair to say, therefore, that many more institutions allow credit for correspondence courses to meet undergraduate degree requirements than do not do this. See Table below.

Table XLIX CORRESPONDENCE COURSES, UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	40	70.2	7	50.0	12	70.6	11	61.1	1	50.0	71	65.7
No	10	17.5	2	14.3	2	11.8	2	11.1	1	50.0	17	15.7
No Mention	7	12.3	5	35.7	3	17.6	5	27.8	0	0.0	20	18.5

Graduate Credit

When the "no mention" responses and the "no" responses, were combined, 93 percent of the respondents were represented. Thus, 7 percent (8 respondents) of the institutions answered "yes" that their institution allows graduate credit for correspondence courses. Of these, 75 percent are from state institutions; 13 percent are from land-grant and denominational schools, respectively. It can be concluded, therefore, that very few institutions included in this study give graduate credit for correspondence courses. See Table below.

Table L CORRESPONDENCE COURSES, GRADUATE LEVEL, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-Grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	6	10.5	1	7.1	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	7.4
No	40	70.2	8	57.1	7	41.2	6	33.3	2	100.0	63	58.3
No Mention	11	19.3	5	35.7	9	52.9	12	66.7	0	0.0	37	34.3

Frequency of Offering of Extension Courses Other than Cooperative Extension

When respondents were asked,"...do you offer extension home economics courses through a University Extension program other than Cooperative Extension?", only 20 (19 percent) answered "yes"; 15 of the 20 respondents were from state institutions. See Table below.

TABLE LI FREQUENCY OF OFFERING EXTENSION COURSES OTHER THAN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municiapl 2		108 Total/	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	15	26.3	3	21.4	1	5.9	1	5.6	0	0.0	20	18.5
No	35	61.4	5	35.7	13	76.5	13	72.2	2	100.0	68	62.9
No Mention	7	12.3	6	42.9	3	17.6	4	22.2	0	0.0	20	18.5

Home Economics Television Courses for Credit

Respondents were asked if they knew of any school which offers home economics television courses for credit. Twelve respondents (11 percent) answered "yes". Of those who answered "yes", 75 percent were from state and land-grant universities. See Table below.

Table LII HOME ECONOMICS TV COURSES FOR CREDIT, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	#	% State 57	#	% Land-grant 14	#	% Denom 17	#	% Private 18	#	% Municipal 2	#	% Total 108
Yes	6	10.5	3	21.4	1	5.9	2	11.1	0	0.0	12	11.1
No	45	78.9	7	50.0	13	76.5	11	61.1	1	50.0	77	71.3
No Mention	6	10.5	4	28.6	3	17.6	5	27.8	1	50.0	19	17.6

Forces Exerting Greatest Impact on Curriculum Change

Home economics administrators were asked, "What forces at your institution have the greatest impact on bringing about home economics curriculum change?" Respondents were asked to place a "1" before the forces having the greatest impact, "2" before the forces having moderate impact and "3" before the forces that have little or no impact. For the purpose of analyzing their answers, the author assigned a numerical value of 3 to their "1" responses, a value of 2 to their "2" responses and a value of 1 to their "3" answers. The list which follows shows in ranked order their responses:

	Weighted Score
Home Economics Faculty	244
Administrators	194
Students	190
Legislation	144
High School Teachers	107
Non-Home Economics Staff	93

This list, perhaps, presents few surprises to the seasoned home economics unit administrator! See Table LIII below.

Table LIII. DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS OPINIONS OF FORCES EXERTING GREATEST IMPACT ON CURRICULUM CHANGE

Degree of Impact	List of Forces											
	H. Econ.		Administra-		Students		Legisla-		High-School		Non-Home Ec.	
	# Faculty	%	# tions	%	#	%	# ture	%	# Teachers	%	# Staff	%
Rated "1"	65	60	40	37	34	32	24	22	5	5	4	4
Rated "2"	23	21	31	29	38	35	20	19	27	25	17	16
Rated "3"	3	3	12	11	12	11	32	30	38	35	47	44
No Response	17	16	25	23	24	22	32	30	38	35	40	37

Designing Standardized Home Economics Achievement Test, By Type of Institution

Home economics administrators were asked whether or not they felt that we, in higher education, should design a national standardized home economics achievement test. The largest number of administrators 40 (37 percent) said "yes" we

should do this; 26 (24 percent) of the administrators said "no".

Of those who answered in the affirmative, the breakdown by institution was as follows: 50 percent were from private, 41 percent were from denominational, 33 percent were from state, and 21 percent were from land-grant institutions. A larger percentage of administrators who said "no" to this item were from state institutions than the other types. About equal percentages of administrators from state, land-grant, and denominational schools had said "not sure" when asked this question about designing a national standardized achievement test in home economics. See Table LIV below.

TABLE LIV

DESIGNING STANDARDIZED HOME ECONOMICS ACHIEVEMENT TEST, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Item	Type of Institution											
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denominational 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	19	33.3	3	21.4	7	41.2	9	50.0	2	100.0	40	37.0
No	18	31.6	3	21.4	2	11.8	3	16.7	0	0.0	26	24.1
No Mention	20	35.1	8	58.2	8	47.0	6	33.3	0	0.0	42	38.9

OFFERING ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Home economics administrators were asked if, in their opinion, home economics in higher education should offer associate (2 year) degree programs in 4-year institutions. About 40 percent of all administrators said "no" while 17 percent said "yes". Of the administrators who said "no", nearly 50 percent were from state, 24 percent were from private, 13 percent were from denominational, and 9 percent were from land-grant institutions. Both of the municipal institution administrators voted "no" on this question.

Of those administrators who voted "yes" to the question of offering

associate degrees in 4-year institutions, 79 percent were from state institutions and 16 percent were from land-grant schools. In general, it can be said that administrators from private and denominational schools did not favor associate degree programs being offered by 4-year institutions.

It could be speculated that administrators in larger institutions do not see the associate degree as a threat to their regular program whereas the administrators in smaller schools might feel the inclusion of an AA (Associate Arts) degree could possibly usurp majors from the four year program. Too, the offerings in a larger institution might accommodate an AA degree program without any (or very little) adjustment in curriculum and staff and thus additional students attracted to the AA degree program would be welcome. These thoughts are strictly those of the author and are not based upon personal experience, observation or fact. See Table below.

TABLE LV
OFFERING ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	15	26.3	3	21.4	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	17.6
No	22	38.6	4	28.6	6	35.3	11	61.1	2	100.0	45	41.7
No Mention	20	35.0	7	50.0	10	58.8	7	38.9	0	0.0	44	40.8

EMPLOYMENT OF A CURRICULUM CONSULTANT WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Respondents were asked whether or not within the past five years they had employed anyone to serve as curriculum consultant in updating the course offerings at their institution. In reponse to this question, 59 respondents (55 percent) answered "no" and 31 respondents (29 percent) answered "yes". Of those respondents in the latter category, 52 percent were from state, 19 percent were from private, 13 percent were from denominational, and 16 percent were from land-

grant institutions. See Table below.

TABLE LVI EMPLOYMENT OF A CURRICULUM CONSULTANT WITHIN PAST FIVE YEARS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Item	Type of Institution											
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	16	28.1	5	35.7	4	23.5	6	33.3	0	0.0	31	28.7
No	35	61.4	5	35.7	10	58.8	7	38.9	2	100.0	59	54.6
No Mention	6	10.5	4	28.6	3	17.6	5	27.8	0	0.0	18	16.8

ACCEPTANCE OF HOME ECONOMICS AS A GENERAL EDUCATION SUBJECT

When asked whether or not their institution accepts any home economics courses in meeting general education requirements, 41 percent of the respondents answered "yes" and 40 percent answered "no". The remaining 19 percent of respondents did not answer the question at all.

Of the respondents who answered the question in the affirmative, 50 percent were from state, 21 percent from denominational, 14 percent from land-grant, 11 percent from private, and 5 percent from municipal institutions.

The fact that the greatest number of "yes" responses were from state institutions might relate to the fact that more state school curricula and programs are emerging while more curricula and programs in the other schools are traditional and more or less inflexible. There is no factual data to prove this suggestion. See Table below.

TABLE LVII ACCEPTANCE OF HOME ECONOMICS AS A GENERAL EDUCATION SUBJECT, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Item	Type of Institution											
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	22	38.6	6	42.9	9	52.9	5	27.8	2	100.0	44	40.7
No	28	49.1	2	14.3	5	29.4	8	44.4	0	0.0	43	39.9
No Mention	7	12.3	6	42.9	3	17.6	5	27.8	0	0.0	21	19.4

INNOVATIONS IN HOME ECONOMICS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Home economics administrators were asked whether or not they had tried any innovations in home economics course offerings. Nearly one-fourth of the respondents said "no" to this question; 60 percent responded with a "yes". Of those who responded "yes", nearly 60 percent were from state, 15 percent were from land-grant, 14 percent from denominational, 11 percent from private, and 2 percent from municipal schools. This shows, again, that administrators of state institution programs perceive their programs to be changing and also to be innovative in nature. See Table below.

Table LVIII INNOVATIONS IN HOME ECONOMICS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
Yes	38	66.7	10	71.4	9	52.9	7	38.9	1	50.0	65	60.1
No	12	21.1	0	0.0	5	29.4	7	38.9	1	50.0	25	23.1
No Mention	7	12.3	4	28.6	3	17.6	4	22.2	0	0.0	18	16.8

INNOVATION IN TEACHING METHODS

When asked if they had tried any innovative approaches in teaching methods, 59 administrators (55 percent) said "yes". Of those in that category, 54 percent were from state, 15 percent from land-grant, 15 percent from denominational, 14 percent from private, and 2 percent from municipal schools.

About 20 percent of the administrators did not answer this question and 25 percent said "no" they had not tried any innovative approaches in teaching methods. Over half (56 percent) of those who answered this item "no" were from state institutions. See Table below.

Table LIX INNOVATIONS IN TEACHING METHODS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	32	56.1	9	64.3	9	52.9	8	44.4	1	50.0	59	54.6
No	15	26.3	1	7.1	5	29.4	5	27.8	1	50.0	27	25.0
No Mention	10	17.5	4	28.6	3	17.6	5	27.8	0	0.0	22	20.4

NEW IDEAS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

When administrators were asked if they had had any 'new ideas' in the planning stage for the 1969-74 period in either teaching methods or course offerings, the following responses were given: 64 responses were "yes" and 25 responses were "no". Of the 64 affirmative responses, 55 percent were from state, 17 percent from denominational, 14 percent from land-grant, and 13 percent from private schools. One of the administrators from a municipal institution was in this category.

From this it would seem, again, that state schools administrators perceive their programs as incorporating "new ideas" to a greater extent than other administrators. See Table below.

Table LX NEW IDEAS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	35	61.4	9	64.3	11	64.7	8	44.4	1	50.0	64	59.4
No	15	26.3	0	0.0	3	17.6	6	33.3	1	50.0	25	23.1
No Mention	7	12.3	5	35.7	3	17.6	4	22.2	0	0.0	19	17.6

FUTURE PLANS FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

When asked, "Within the next 5 years do you plan any interdiciplinary

programs?", 56 respondents (52 percent) answered "yes". Over half of these (55 percent) were from state, 20 percent from denominational, 14 percent from land-grant, 9 percent from private, and 2 percent from municipal institutions.

"No" responses were given by 29 (27 percent of the respondents); nearly 60 percent of these responses were from state institutions.

From the comments written on the returned questionnaires, the most often mentioned subject matter areas for new programs were in Child Development, Early Childhood Education, and Dietetics (Food Service Administration) Institutional Administration. "Welfare" programs were mentioned in third rank. See Table below.

Table LXI FUTURE PLANS FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
Yes	31	54.4	8	57.1	11	64.7	5	27.8	1	50.0	56	51.9
No	17	29.8	1	7.1	3	17.6	7	38.9	1	50.0	29	26.9
No Mention	9	15.8	5	35.7	3	17.6	6	33.3	0	0.0	23	21.3

OFFERINGS TO HELP STUDENTS UNDERSTAND POVERTY

When asked,"...are you making a special effort to help students understand poverty and/or to prepare them for jobs with the culturally and economically disadvantaged?", 75 (69 percent)respondents answered "yes". Of those in this category, 57 percent were from state, 15 percent from denominational, 13 percent from land-grant, 13 percent from private, and 1 percent from municipal institutions. Perhaps the high percentage of responses in this category from state schools may be accounted for by the fact that "future teachers" are being exposed to the ghetto schools and a miriad of other experiences in preparation for teaching. It would seem, however, that more land-grand and other institutions should be making a special

effort along this line.

From this data, it would appear that nearly one-third of all institutions are not making an effort to help students understand poverty or to prepare them for jobs with the culturally and economically disadvantaged. See Table below.

TABLE LXII OFFERINGS TO HELP STUDENTS UNDERSTAND POVERTY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
Yes	43	75.4	10	71.4	11	64.7	10	55.6	1	50.0	75	69.4
No	6	10.5	0	0.0	3	17.6	3	16.7	1	50.0	13	12.0
No Mention	8	14.0	4	28.6	3	17.6	5	27.8	0	0.0	20	18.5

PROMOTION OF HOME ECONOMICS RESEARCH

Respondents were asked if they are making any special effort to encourage research projects at the undergraduate level. Slightly fewer than 50 percent of all respondents answered "yes". Of those who did, however, nearly 60 percent were from state, 17 percent from private, 15 percent from denominational, and 9 percent from land-grant schools. It might seem more logical for land-grant universities to have reported the largest number of "yes" responses in this category since they have, in general, more research facilties and funds than other institutions.

There were 41 (38 percent) respondents who answered this item "no" and another 20 (19 percent) who did not repond to the question; respondents in these two categories totaled 57 percent of the total group. See Table below.

Table LXIII PROMOTION OF HOME ECONOMICS RESEARCH, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	# State 57	%	# Land-grant 14	%	# Denom 17	%	# Private 18	%	# Municipal 2	%	# Total 108	%
Yes	27	47.4	4	28.6	7	41.2	8	44.4	1	50.0	47	43.5
No	23	40.4	5	35.7	7	41.2	5	27.8	1	50.0	41	38.0
No Mention	7	12.3	5	35.7	3	17.6	5	27.8	0	0.0	20	18.5

INTERDISCIPLINARY OR INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS

Respondents were asked if they were presently offering any interdisciplinary or interdepartmental programs. 61 (57 percent) of the respondents answered "yes". An analysis of those responses by type of institution shows that 56 percent of these were from state, 16 percent from private, 13 percent from land-grant, 12 percent from denominational, and 3 percent from municipal institutions. It is interesting to note that twice as many state institutions answered "yes" (34) as answered "no" (17) to this item.

It is encouraging to see that more than half of all respondents presently offer interdisciplinary or interdepartmental programs. In view of the complexity of our special problems and needs, and in view of the spiraling cost of higher education, it seems highly desirable for programs and courses of a multidisciplinary or multidepartmental nature to be offered. See Table below.

Table LXIV INTERDISCIPLINARY OR INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	# State 57	%	# Land-grant 14	%	# Denom 17	%	# Private 18	%	# Municipal 2	%	# Total 108	%
Yes	34	59.6	8	57.1	7	41.2	10	55.6	2	100.0	61	56.5
No	17	29.8	2	14.3	6	35.3	3	16.7	0	0.0	28	25.9
No Mention	6	10.5	4	28.6	4	23.5	5	27.8	0	0.0	19	17.6

CHANGING THE NAME OF THE HOME ECONOMICS UNIT.

Respondents were asked,"...in your opinion, is it wise for individual institutions to change the name of their home economics unit without a nationwide coordination in the change?" An analysis of the responses is very interesting.

Only 13 percent of all administrators gave a "yes" answer to this question. Of those who gave this opinion, 50 percent were from state, 29 percent were from land-grant, 14 percent from private, and 7 percent from denominational institutions. From this it might be postulated that a higher percentage of new names might appear on state university rather than other types of institutions. To the present time, however, most of the schools changing the name of their home economics unit have been land-grant universities.

While 13 percent favored a name change, 51 percent of the respondents held the opinion that this was not wise without a nationwide coordination in the change. When the latter was combined with the "no answer" and the "not sure" responses, the percentage of respondents became a significant 87 percent.

Despite the fact that 87 percent of the administrators in this study said that, in their opinion, it was not wise for individual institutions to change the name of their home economics unit without a nationwide coordination in the change, more schools are changing their names. Unfortunately, these are large and prestigious schools. In the opinion of the author, this presents a serious problem. It is conceivable that traditional home economics programs may be eroded by default; the gate-keeper may be found sleeping at his post! See Table below.

Table LXV CHANGING THE NAME OF THE HOME ECONOMICS UNIT, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution					
Item	# % State 57	# % Land-grant 14	# % Denom 17	# % Private 18	# % Municipal 2	# % Total 108
Yes	7 12.3	4 28.6	1 5.9	2 11.1	0 0.0	14 13.0
No	30 52.6	5 35.7	11 64.7	7 38.9	2 100.0	50 50.9
No Answer	20 35.1	5 35.7	5 29.4	9 50.0	0 0.0	39 36.1

The author asks permission of the reader to include data on this subject collected February, 1970 at the annual meeting of the National Council of Home Economics Administrators held in Chicago. A questionnaire was distributed to NCAHE members and was answered on a volunteer basis by 83 administrators of home economics units. The results of this survey will not appear in any other publication. Since it is felt that the material has special professional relevance at this time, parts of it are being included here in the same form in which it was distributed to NCAHE members.

A. THE NAME CHANGE

1. In recent years, has your institution given serious consideration to changing the name of home economics?
   Answer: 20 yes 62 no 1 no answer

   Comments:

   (1) There's been no need to. We've been allowed to do new and futuristic things as Home Economics, (2) Not seriously.

2. Did you change your name? If "yes" to what?
   Answer: 3 yes 60 no 20 no answer

   Comment:

   Changed to Family Resources.

3. If your answer to No. 1 was "yes" but you did not change your name, why was the idea rejected?

   Comments:

   (1) Could not come up with one we really felt said what we strive for;

(2) Unreadiness of potential clientele and general public to relate to new name; (3) Still under consideration; (4) After a number of brain storming sessions and studies of other departments, we have found nothing as acceptable as Home Economics. We are very willing to change when we find a better and more meaningful name.

4. To what extent is your staff presently considering a name change? Answer: 4 seriously considering 18 matter under study 57 not all considering 4 not considering at this date.

5. If at present you are seriously considering a name change, by what date might this change take place?

Comments:

Possibly by July 1, 1971; by 1975.

6. If a name change were inevitable for your institution, in ranked order, which of the three following names are most appealing to you? (most appealing, #1, etc.) Responses were as follows:

1st	2nd	3rd		1st	2nd	3rd		1st	2nd	3rd	
1	3	3	Human Development	1	1	4	Family Living	7	14	13	Family Resourses and Consumer Sciences
8	3	3	Human Ecology	2	7	1	Home & Family Living	22	0	7	Home Economics, Family Life & Consumer Education
12	3	3	Family Resource	10	9	6	Family & Consumer Sciences				

When these scores were weighted (3 points for all 1st choice answers; 2 points for all 2nd choice answers; 1 point for all 3rd choice answers) the ranked order list is as follows:

Home Economics, Family Life and Consumer Education
Family Resources and Consumer Sciences
Family and Consumer Sciences
Family Resources
Human Ecology
Home and Family Living
Human Development
Family Living

Comments:

(1) Add Homecology; (2) None of these really cover the field as home economics; (3) Add Euthenics.

7. In your opinion, what are the strongest arguments for <u>not</u> changing the name of home economics?

Comments:

(1) We are fast losing our identity, and unless the family or home appears in the title we will be lost to other disciplines. The concept of involvement of other disciplines is good but we must not forget the important role we play; (2) In our area, the term home economics has respect. I have tested the new names on my colleagues and friends with a request that they tell me what would be taught in a department with a name such as "Human Development" or "Human Ecology" etc. None answered with home economics subject matter areas. The work done by AHEA, home economics publications, and other established name-related programs tend to reinforce the present name; (3) AHEA resolutions as of June, 1969, support NOT changing the name; (4) Change in content is important and will change our image. Change in name is superficial; (5) I believe that retaining the name Home Economics has considerably more merit than changing it. This has been a recognized discipline for over 60 years, and I do not believe that there is anything to be ashamed of in Home Economics; (6) The definition of home economics as per the Lake Placid Conference is adequate today just as it was then---we need only to implement this definition and develop curricula with the breadth and depth of the original definition and goals.

8. In your opinion, what are the strongest arguments in favor of a name change?

Comments:

(1) None, if we switch names every 60 years how will the public ever learn of our potential value? (2) Administrators (deans, vice-presidents, etc.) do not seem to think the name is appropiate; (3) Some of the ideas about home economics content that has been misinterpreted might be dropped with a name change; (4) Home economics has a questionable positiion as a college program. People continue to equate it with cooking and sewing. Perhaps a change in name will create a greater awareness of the true scope and value of home economics; (5) None, in my opinion---just what does a change by itself ever accomplish?

9. (a) In your opinion, will large numbers of students graduating from the schools who have recently changed their name consider themselves home economists? Answer: <u>16</u> yes <u>31</u> no <u>36</u> no answer

Comments:

(1) I don't know, but they aren't going to call themselves human

developers or human ecologists. Some will, some won't; probably, fewer will; (2) Ours do. If encouraged and informed; (3) Many graduating from schools who have not changed their name will not consider themselves home economists. Those whose employment is directly "home economics" will.

(b) Would it be your guess that they will join and support AHEA?
Answer: 15 yes 33 no 35 no answer

It would seem that some rather significant facts emerging from this data are as follows:

1- About 1/3 of the administrators responding to this questionnaire had given serious consideration to changing the name of home economics in recent years.

2- Only 3 schools represented in this survey had changed their name.

3- The reasons given for not changing the name, after giving it consideration seem to be valid reasons:
a- could not come up with one that better defines the field.
b- felt the various publics not ready to accept a new name.
c- felt that the present name was more acceptable than some of the new names chosen and used.

4- About 1/3 of the schools included in this survey are still considering a name change.

5- Very few schools represented have selected a date by which they hope to have made their decision.

6- If a name change were inevitable, respondents selected "Home Economics, Family Life and Consumer Education" as their first choice - when weighted scores were used, (see p. 69).

7- The strongest argument for not changing the name of home economics had to do with the matter of losing professional identity.

8- The strongest arguments in favor of a name change were actually very weak; two out of five respondents said there were no strong arguments on this side of the issue.

9- Nearly twice as many respondents felt that graduates of the schools who have recently changed their names would not consider themselves home economists upon graduation from their institutions as would.

To repeat, this is a very serious problem in the opinion of the author. It is one that should be receiving consideration at the state and national level by home economists from all professional sections and in all types of home economics careers, as well as by alumni who are not employed.

ADVISEABILITY OF RECRUITING ACADEMICALLY TALENTED STUDENTS

The questionnaire asked if, in their opinion, home economists in higher education should be making a "special effort" to recruit the academically talented.

Of the 90 respondents who answered this item, 86 (80 percent) answered "yes", one answered "no" and three answered "not sure". The remaining 18 respondents did not answer the item. See Table LXVI below.

Table LXVI ADVISEABILITY OF RECRUITING ACADEMICALLY TALENTED STUDENTS

Respondents	Number of Respondents Answering Item:			
	No Answer	Yes	No	Not Sure
Total #	18	86	1	3
Group %	16.8	79.6	0.9	2.7

RECRUITING MORE MEN STUDENTS INTO HOME ECONOMICS

Home economics administrators were asked whether or not in their opinion we should be recruiting substantially more men as students. About 19 percent of all administrators in this study did not answer the question. Of those who did answer the question, 71 (65.7 percent) felt that we should do this. Home economics administrators from state institutions composed 58 percent of the affirmative answers. Land-grant, denominational, and private institutions each composed slightly less than 15 percent of the "yes" answers. One of the two municipal administrators answered in this category.

Only four administrators from all institutions voted "no" on this question; two were from denominational and two were from private schools.

Thirteen administrators (12 percent) recorded a "not sure" answer; 9 of the 13 (69 percent) were from state institutions.

When the three categories (no answer, no, am not sure) were combined, slightly more than one-third of all administrators were included. It could

be said, therefore, that about two-thirds of all home economics administrators in this study agreed that we should be recruiting more men students into home economics programs in higher education.

The author feels that it could be safely postulated that if the present trend of employing men as Deans, Directors and Heads of college home economics programs continues at its present rate, larger numbers of men students will come into home economics without a great deal of special recruiting. This should especially be true if the belief system of the man administrator is truly pro-home economics - in the traditional sense of home economics programs. See Table below.

Table LXVII RECRUITING MORE MEN STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
Yes	41	71.9	10	71.4	9	52.9	10	55.6	1	50.0	71	65.7
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	11.8	2	11.1	0	0.0	4	3.7
No Mention	16	38.1	4	28.6	6	35.3	6	33.4	1	50.0	33	30.5

RECRUITING MORE MEN FACULTY MEMBERS

Home economics administrators were asked their opinion about whether or not more men faculty members should be recruited into home economics in higher education. Although only 16 percent of all administrators responded with a "no" to that question, when their responses were added to the "no answer" and "not sure" categories, it represented 63 percent of the total group of administrators. On the other hand, 37 percent of all administrators in this study gave a "yes" opinion to this question.

When the opinions of the 40 (37 percent) of "yes" responses were analyzed, 60 percent were from state, 18 percent from private, 13 percent from denominational, and 10 percent from land-grant institutions.

An analysis of the opinions of those administrators who gave a "no" response to the question of recruiting more men faculty members shows that: 35 percent were from denominational, 29 percent from state, 18 percent from land-grant, and 12 percent from private schools. One of the two administrators from municipal institutions gave a "no" response.

It is postulated by the author that the group of administrators who voted in the largest numbers against the recruitment of men faculty members, namely, administrators from denominational schools, have had less experience with men faculty members than other administrators. The percentage of land-grant administrators giving a "yes" opinion (29 percent) was not too different from the number who gave a "no" opinion (21 percent). The author would be interested in knowing whether land-grant administrators have had more experience with men faculty members than admistrators from other types of institutions and whether or not their opinion has been affected in the negative by their experience.

Opinions of administrators from state institutions differed greatly from those of the land-grant administrators. Nearly five times as many state institution administrators gave a "yes" opinion as gave a "no" opinion on this matter. It would be interesting to know the reasons for these differences of opinion. See Table below.

Table LXVIII RECRUIT MORE MEN FACULTY MEMBERS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution											
Item	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	State 57		Land-grant 14		Denom 17		Private 18		Municipal 2		Total 108	
Yes	24	42.1	4	28.6	5	29.4	7	38.9	0	0.0	40	37.0
No	5	8.8	3	21.4	6	35.3	2	11.1	1	50.0	17	15.7
No Ment.	28	49.1	7	50.0	6	35.3	9	50.0	1	50.0	51	47.2

RECRUITING MORE MINORS IN HOME ECONOMICS

Home economics administrators were asked to give their opinion about whether or not we should make an effort to recruit more home economics minors. Nearly half of all administrators said "yes" to this question. Of those who gave this opinion, 54 percent were from state, 43 percent were from land-grant, 39 percent were from private, and 29 percent were from denominational schools. One municipal institution (50 percent) said "yes" and the other one (50 percent) said "no".

Twelve administrators (11 percent) answered this question with a "no" and 24 (22 percent) answered "not sure". Of those in this last category, 41 percent were from denominational, 22 percent from private, 19 percent from state, and 14 percent from land-grant institutions.

When it is considered that 22 administrators did not answer the question at all, that 12 said "no", and that 24 said "not sure", it would appear that the majority of the administrators (58 or 53.7 percent) did not have the opinion that we should make an effort to recruit more home economics minors.

It has been the experience of the author in talking with home economics college faculty that quite a number of them feel that too often the minor in home economics goes out into the work world and gets a job requiring the skills and knowledge of a home economics major and tries to perform her duties as if she were a major. The comment is often made that a home economics education major has little enough time to develop for her professional tasks and to have less than a major could mean little except poor performance on the job. Attitudes such as these might account for some of the "no answer", "no", and "not sure" responses of the administrators. See Table below.

Table LXIX RECRUITING MORE MINORS IN HOME ECONOMICS, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution									
Item	# State 57	%	# Land-grant 14	%	# Denom. 17	%	# Private 18	%	# Municipal 2	%	# Total 108	%
Yes	31	54.4	6	42.9	5	29.4	7	38.9	1	50.0	50	46.3
No	5	8.8	2	14.3	1	5.9	3	16.7	1	50.0	12	11.1
No Mention	21	36.8	6	42.9	11	64.7	8	44.4	0	0.0	46	42.6

REQUIREMENT OF GRADUATE RECORD OR NATIONAL TEACHERS EXAMINATION FOR SENIORS

Administrators of home economics units were asked if their institution requires seniors to take the Graduate Record or another type of comprehensive examination (i.e. National Teachers Examination) prior to baccalaureate graduation. "Yes" answers were given by 44 (41 percent) of the respondents. Of those who said "yes", nearly half (46 percent) were from state, 25 percent from denominational, 21 percent from private, and 9 percent from land-grant institutions. Perhaps the explanation for state schools requiring an examination of this type before graduation five times more frequently than land-grant schools stems from the fact that so many state universities began as normal schools or teachers colleges. Their strong orientation through the years has been toward the preparation of teachers and Graduate Record and the National Teachers Examinations are especially appropriate for this group of students.

A larger number of respondents reported that the above examinations were not required of their students. Of the 47 (44 percent) in this category, 64 percent were from state institutions. It might be of interest to point out that 20 respondents from state institutions answered this question in the affirmative while 30 respondents reported that the examinations were not required. Seven respondents did not answer the item. See Table below.

Table LXX GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Type of Institution					
Item	# % State 57	# % Land-grant 14	# % Denom. 17	# % Private 18	# % Municipal 2	# % Total 108
Yes	20 35.1	4 28.6	11 64.7	9 50.0	0 0.0	44 40.7
No	30 52.6	6 42.9	3 17.6	6 33.3	2 100.0	47 43.5
No Mention	7 12.3	4 28.6	3 17.6	3 16.7	0 0.0	17 15.7

ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF SENIORS WHO WILL DO GRADUATE WORK WITHIN THREE YEARS

Respondents were asked to estimate the number of 1968-69 seniors who will go on for advanced work within the next three years. From the table below it can be seen that 57 percent felt 0-10 students would do this; 10 percent estimated 11-16 students; a significant 16 percent estimated from 17 to more than 30 would pursue graduate work within the next three years. These percentages take into account the fact that 18 respondents (17 percent) did not answer the item.

There are at least four forces at work which would make it reasonable to expect larger numbers of recent graduates in home economics to pursue graduate work soon after completion of their baccalaureate degree: (1) the number of institutions of higher education offering master's degrees is on the increase, making graduate education more accessible, (2) the number of students majoring in home economics is on the increase, (3) home economics faculties have been spending greater effort in encouraging students to pursue graduate work, and (4) the shortage of teaching positions is becoming a factor in helping students to decide to continue their education. See Table below.

Table LXXI ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF 1968-69 SENIORS WHO WILL DO GRADUATE WORK WITHIN THE NEXT THREE YEARS

	Number of Seniors									
Respondents	No Answer	0-2	3-4	5-7	8-10	11-13	14-16	17-19	20-30	More than 30
Total #	18	11	19	16	16	5	6	1	8	8
Group %	16.8	10.2	17.6	14.8	14.8	4.6	5.6	0.9	7.4	7.4

ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF GRADUATES WHO WILL TEACH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Respondents were asked to make an estimate of the number of 1968-69 seniors who would accept employment in elementary school teaching. Nearly 39 percent of the respondents estimated that no home economics graduate would teach elementary education. About 45 percent estimated that from 1-5 graduates would accept employment in elementary teaching; 17 percent answered from 6 to 13 or more.

Although it is not possible from the data collected in this study to equate this item to a percentage of the total bachelor's degrees awarded, the fact that the respondents estimated that 309 individual home economics majors would accept employment in elementary school teaching is a significant fact. This data lends credence to the idea that the number of home economics degrees awarded in any given year cannot be equated with the number of individuals seeking employment in home economics jobs. It also tends to show that home economics is the field with "1001 career choices". With the gap closing between supply and demand for elementary teachers, the opportunity for home economics graduates to find employment in elementary teaching may drastically decrease in the very near future. Contrariwise, if public education is made widely available to kindergarten children, home economics graduates, especially those who have majored in child development, may find

this a ready source of employment. See Table below.

Table LXXII ESTIMATE OF GRADUATES WHO WILL TEACH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

	Number of Home Economics Graduates									
Respondents	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7-9	10-12	13 or more
Total #	42	9	11	10	10	8	5	2	7	4
Group %	38.9	8.3	10.2	9.3	9.3	7.4	4.6	1.9	6.5	3.7

TRAINING OF PROGRAM WRITERS FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS USING EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Respondents were asked if, in their opinion, home economics in higher education should be training program writers for computer assisted instruction, dial-access courses, and the like. The "no answer" and "not sure" categories totalled 67 responses (62 percent). Of the remaining, 22 respondents (20 percent) answered "yes". All others were "no" responses.

It is encouraging to the author to see administrators of home economics programs planning in this direction; a great many professional fields are ahead of home economics in this regard.[15] See Table below.

Table LXXIII TRAINING OF HOME ECONOMICS "PROGRAM WRITERS"

	Number of Institutions Training Program Writers			
Respondents	No Answer	Yes	No	Not Sure
Total #	23	22	19	44
Group %	21.3	20.4	17.6	40.7

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate current baccalaureate degree programs in home economics units in higher education and to obtain pertinent ancillary information related to these programs. College catalogs were studied to obtain selected facts; information returned on a questionnaire sent to home economics administrators supplemented the catalog data.

Aspects of the curricula studied include such things as : (1) number and type of courses offered, (2) facts about various home economics majors, (3) distribution of total semester hours required for graduation, (4) characteristics of home economics core requirements, (5) characteristics of home economics minors, and others. In addition, the questionnaire sought answers to questions dealing with, for example: (1) recent changes in curricula, (2) interdisciplinary or interdepartmental programs, (3) offerings to help students understand poverty, (4) home economics television courses for credit, (5) forces exerting an impact on curriculum change, (6) associate degree programs, and so forth.

A random sample of all institutions within the categories of: (1) state, (2) land-grant, (3) denominational, (4) private, and (5) municipal were included. The total number of institutions in the study was 108; they represented all regions of the United States with thegreatest representation being from the East North Central region.

The respondents in this study were defined by a wide variety of characteristics: (1) type of institution, (2) region of USA, (3) type of school term, (4) type of administration of the home economics unit, (5) size of home economics faculty, (6) number of undergraduate majors enrolled, (7) hours required for graduation, (8) types of degrees offered

SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS IN THIS STUDY

Item	State	Land-Grant	Private	Denominational	Municipal	All Institutions in This Study
Type of School Term	77% - Semesters 21% - Quarters 20% - Trimesters	71% - Semesters 29% - Quarters	94% - Semesters 6% - Other	82% - Semesters 12% - Quarters 6% - Other	100% - Semesters	80% - Semesters 17% - Quarters 1% - Trimesters 2% - Other
Type of Administration of Home Economics Unit	28% autonomous 19% in Applied Arts & Science 19% in Education Units	57% - Autonomous 21% - Agriculture	33% - Autonomous 17% - Applied Arts & Science 17% - Natural Science	29% - Applied Arts & Sciences 18% - Autonomous 18% - Social Science 18% - Natural Science	1 School–Applied Arts & Sciences 1 School–Natural Science	30% - autonomous 19% - Applied Arts & Science 11% - Education 7% - Natural Science 6% - Fine Arts 4% - Agriculture 4% - Social Science
Size of Faculty	10% - 3 or less 37% - less than 7 38% - 10 or more 4% - more than 30	None - 3 or less 21% - less than 7 71% - 10 or more 36% - more than 30	50% - 3 or less 67% - 7 or less 17% 10 or more 6%, More than 30	53% - 3 or less 94% - 7 or less 6% - 10 or less 6%, More than 30	50% - 3 or less 67% - less than 7 17% - 10 or more 6% - more than 30	49% - 6 or less (¼-3 or less) 17% - 7-9 (Av. Faculty - 10) 20% - 10-20 13% - 21 or more (2/3 or larger Facs.) 8% - 30 or more (Autonomous units)
Size of Library	23% - 100,000-199,999 vols. 18% - 200,000-299,999 vols. 12% - 300,000-500,000 vols. 7% - 600,000 or more 28% did not respond	14% - 500,000-600,000 vols. 14% - more than 1 million 7% - 600,000 - 1 million 57% did not respond	17% - 100,000-200,000 vols. 11% - 200,000-300,000 vols. 6% - 600,000-1 Million vols. 6% - Under 100,000 vols. 61% did not respond	35% - Under 100,000 vols. 6% - 600,000-1 Million vols. 59% did not respond	50% - under 100,000 vols 50% - 300,000-400,000 vols.	No data coll. for 50% institutions 25% - 200,000 or less vols. 11% - 200,000-299,999 10% - more than 500,000 3 institutions - more than 1 Mil.
Number of Undergraduate Majors	20% - 0-120 Majors 44% - 121-299 18% - 300-499 9% - Over 500 11% did not respond	21% - 0-120 Majors 21% - 121-299 7% - 300-499 21% - over 500 29% did not respond	72% - 0-120 Majors 11% - 121-299 17% did not respond	77% - 0-120 Majors 6% - 121-299 Majors 18% did not respond	50% - 0-120 Majors 50% - 121-299 Majors	37% - 0-120 Majors 30% - 121-299 10% - 300-499 8% - Over 500 15% did not respond
Semester Hours Required for Graduation	37% - 129-135 28% - 126-128 30% - 120-125 2% - 136-140	36% - 129-135 14% - 126-128 43% - 120-125 7% - 136-140	22% - 129-135 39% - 126-128 22% - 120-125 17% - 136-140	35% - 129-135 35% - 126-128 23% - 120-125 0% - 136-140	50% - 126-128 50% - 120-125	Approx 1/3 - 129-135 Approx 1/3 - 126-128 Approx 1/3 - 120-125 5% require 136-140
Types of Undergratuate Degrees	47% offer B.A. & B.S. 26% offer B.S. in H. Ec. 11% offer B.S. in Ed.	No Land Grant offers B.A. 57% - B.S. 29% - B.S. in H.Ec. 7% - B.S. in Ed.	56% offer B.A. & B.S. 33% offer B.S. in H.Ec. 0% offer B.S. in Ed.	49% offer B.A. & B.S. None offers B.S. in H.Ec. None offers B.S. in Ed.	100% offer B.A. & B.S.	2/3 offer B.A. or B.S. 23% offer B.S. in H.Ec. 18% offer B.S. in Ed.
Types of Masters Degrees						18% offer M.S. 11% offer M.S. in Ed. 5% offer M.A. 3% offer M.S. in H.Ec. 67% offer no Masters
Types of Doctorates						6% offer Ed.D. only 6% offer Ed.D. & Ph.D. 1% offer Ph.D. only 85% offer no Doctorates
Total Bachelors Degrees Awarded 1968-1969	35% - 20 or less 39% - 21-50 19% - 50-100 5% - 101-160 2%, more than 160	43% - 20 or less 29% - 21-50 7% - 50-100 14% - 101-160 7%, more than 160	61% - 20 or less 17% - 21-50 11% - 50-100 11% - 101-160 0% more than 160	71% - 20 or less 24% - 21-50 0% - 50-100 0% - 101-160 6%, More than 160	100% - 20 or less 0% - 21-50 0% - 50-100 0% - 101-160 0%, more than 160	29% - 20 or less 31% - 21-50 13% - 50-100 7% - 101-160 3%, more than 160
Total Masters Degrees Awarded 1968-1969						16% - 9 or less 7% - 10-20 6% - 21 or more 70% - None
Total Doctorates Awarded, 1968-1969						2% - 4 2% - 1 96% - None

Item	State	Land Grant	Private	Denominational	Municipal	All Institutions in This Study
Number of Different Majors	37% offer 2 or less 30% offer 5-8 28% offer 3-4 5% offer more than 9	50% offer more than 9 29% offer 3-4 14% offer 2 or less 7% offer 5-8	61% offer 3-4 28% offer 2 or less 6% offer 5-8 6% more than 9	47% offer 2 or less 41% offer 3 or 4 6% offer 5-8 6%, more than 9	100% offer 3 or 4	13% offer 1 20% offer 2 37% offer 3-5 19% offer 5-8 4% offer 9-12 4% offer more than 12
General Education Requirements	49% - 41-50% 32% - 21-40% 12% - 51-60% 7% - 30% or less	50% - 41-50% 43% - 21-40% 7% - 30% or less	44% - 51-60% 33% - 41-50% 17% - 21-40% 6%, more than 61%	47% - 51-60% 35% - 41-50% 18% - 21-40%	50% - 41-50% 50% - 21-40%	44% - 41-50% 20% - 21-40% 21% - 51-60% 5%, 30% or less 1%, 61% or more
Professional Education Requirements	38% require 13-20% 33% require 5-12% 16% require 0-5% 13%, more than 21%	36% - 13-20% 21% - 5-12% 27% - 0-5% 14%, more than 21%	28% require 13-20% 39% require 5-12% 28% require 0-5% 6%, more than 21%	35% - 13-20% 35% - 5-12% 18% - 0-5% 12%, more than 21%	50% equire 13-20% 50% require 5-12%	36% - 13-20% 33% - 5-12% 19% - 0-5% 11%, 21% or more
Home Economics Core Requirements	32% require core	50% require core	56% require core	29% require core	0% requires a core	Range is from 10 or less to more than 40 semester hours. 20% required 21-30 18% required 11-20 11% required 31-40 9%, less than 10, 41%, no core
Hours Required In Home Economics Core	41% - 21-30 30% - 20 or less 16% - 31-40 21 Sem. hrs. average	57% - 20 or less 43% - 21-30 19 S.hrs. Average	50%, 20 or less 38% - 21-30 13% - 31-40 18 S.hrs Average	40% - 31-40 30%, 20 or less 10% - 21-30 22 S.hrs. Average	100% - 31-40 35 S.hrs average	Average range is from 18-35 semester hours
Number of Home Economics Minors						38% offer 1 minor only 40% offer 3 minors 3% offer 2 minors 2% offer 5 minors 52% offer no minors
New Home Economics Curricula Offerings	62% - State Schools 14% - Added new Curr.	14% added new Curr.	6% added new Curr.	12% added new Curr.	Neither municipal institution in this study added new curricula offerings.	12% added new curricula offerings in past 3-5 years.
Programs for Older Undergraduates	37% offer programs	36% offer program	11% offer program	41% offer program	Neither municipal institution offers program.	32% offer programs 24% offer none
Design Refresher Courses for Outdated Graduates	70% designed	57% designed	67% designed	77% designed	50% designed	69% designed

Item	State	Land Grant	Private	Denominational	Municipal	All Institutions in This Study
Education TV in Home Economics Undergraduate Level	53% - No 33% - Yes	29% - No 36% - Yes	28% - No 39% - Yes	35% - No 47% - Yes	50% - No 50% - Yes	43% had no Educational TV in Home Economics Undergraduate Level. 37% had Educational TV.
Educational TV in Home Economics Graduate Level	77% - No 5% - Yes	36% - No 29% - Yes	28% - No 11% - Yes	53% - No 0% - Yes	50% - No 50% - Yes	59% had no Educational TV in Home Economics Graduate Level. 9% had Educational TV.
Correspondence Courses Undergraduate Level	70% - No 18% - Yes	50% - Yes 14% - No	61% - Yes 11% - No	71% - Yes 12% - No	50% - Yes 50% - No	71% had correspondence courses. 16% had no correspondence courses.
Correspondence Courses Graduate Level	70% - No 11% - Yes	57% - No 7% - Yes	33% - No 0% - Yes	41% - No 6% - Yes	100% - No	58% had no correspondence courses. 7% had correspondence courses.
Extension Home Economics Courses (Not Co-op Ext.)	61% - No 26% - Yes	36% - No 21% - Yes	72% - No 6% - Yes	77% - No 6% - Yes	100% - No	63% had no Extension Home Economics courses. 19% had Extension Home Economics courses.
Home Economics TV Courses for Credit	79% - No 11% - Yes	50% - No 21% - Yes	61% - No 11% - Yes	77% - No 6% - Yes	50% - No 0% - Yes	71% had no Home Economics TV courses for credit. 11% had Home Economics TV courses for credit.
Designing Home Economics Achievement Test	33% - Yes 32% - No 25% - Uncertain	21% - Yes 21% - No 29%, Uncertain	50% - Yes 17% - No 11%, uncertain	41% - Yes 12% - No 24%, uncertain	100% - Yes – No – Uncertain	37% - Yes 24% - No 22%, uncertain
Offering Associate Degree Programs in 4-Year Institution	39% - No 26% - Yes 18% - Uncertain	29% - No 21% - Yes 21%, Uncertain	61% - No 0% - Yes 17%, uncertain	35% - No 6% - Yes 35%, uncertain	100% - No – Yes – Uncertain	42% - No 18% - Yes 20%, uncertain
Had Curriculum Consultant	61% - No 28% - Yes	36% - No 36% - Yes	39% - No 33% - Yes	59% - No 24% - Yes	100% - No – Yes	55% - No 29% - Yes
Is Home Economics Accepted As General Education Requirement	39% - Yes 49% - No	43% - Yes 14% - No	28% - Yes 44% - No	53% - Yes 29% - No	100% - Yes – No	41% - Yes 40% - No
Largest Lecture Classes	35% - 51-100 enrolled 19% - 31-50 enrolled 16% - 101-200 enrolled 7% - 21-30 enrolled 2% - 20 or less 4% - 201 or more 18%, no reply	36% - 51-100 enrolled 7% - 31-50 enrolled 14% - 101-200 enrolled 7% - 21-30 0% - 20 or less 7% - 201 or more 29%, no reply	11% - 51-100 enrolled 28% - 31-50 enrolled 0% - 101-200 22% - 21-30 17% - 20 or less 0% - 201 or more 22%, no reply	6% - 51-100 enrolled 41% - 31-50 6% - 101-200 18% - 21-30 0% - 20 or less 0% - 201 or more 29%, no reply	100%, no reply	26% - 51-100 enrolled 22% - 31-50 12% - 101-200 11% - 21-30 4% - 20 or less 2% - 201 or more 24%, no reply
Average Lecture Class	39% - 16-25 enrolled 28% - 26-40 enrolled 7% - 15 or less 7% 41-60 2%, over 60 18%, no reply	29% - 16-25 enrolled 29% - 26-40 enrolled 0% - 15 or less 7% - 41-60 7% - over 60 29%, no reply	33% - 16-25 enrolled 11% - 26-40 33% - 15 or less 0% - 41-60 0% - over 60 22%, no reply	41% - 16-25 enrolled 12% - 26-40 18% - 15 or less 0% - 41-60 0% - over 60 30%, no reply	0% - 16-25 enrolled 0% - 26-40 0% - 15 or less 0% - 41-60 0% - over 60 100%, no reply	36% - 16-25 enrolled 23% - 26-40 12% - 15 or less 5% - 41-60 2% - over 60 23%, no reply

Item	State	Land Grant	Private	Denominational	Municipal	All Institutions in this Study
Smallest Lecture Class	44% - 5-10 enrolled 14% - 4 or less 23% - 11-16 19% , no reply	43% - 5-10 enrolled 14% - 4 or less 14% - 11-16 29%, no reply	39% - 5-10 enrolled 33% - 4 or less 6% - 11-16 22%, No reply	47% - 5-10 enrolled 24% - 4 or less 0% - 11-16 29%, No reply	0% - 5-10 enrolled 0% - 4 or less 0% - 11-16 100% - no reply	43% - 5-10 enrolled 19% - 4 or less 15% - 11-16 24%, No reply
Largest Lab Enrollment	23% - 11-20 enrolled 23% - 21-30 18% - 31-40 0%, 41 or more 32%, no reply	21% - 11-20 enrolled 21% - 21-30 7% - 31-40 0% - 41 or more 50% no reply	44% - 11-20 enrolled 17% - 21-30 0% - 31-40 0% - 41 or more 39%, No reply	29% - 11-20 enrolled 18% - 21-30 0% - 31-40 12% - 41 or more 41%, No reply	0% - 11-20 enrolled 0% - 21-30 0% - 31-40 0% - 41 or more 100% No reply	26% - 11-20 enrolled 20% 21-30 10% - 31-40 5% - 41 or More 38%, No reply
Average Lab Enrollment	36% - 16-24 enrolled 21% - 6-15 9% - 25 or more 35%, no reply	28% - 16-24 7% - 6-15 14% - 25 or more 50%, no reply	11% - 16-24 enrolled 45% - 6-15 0% - 25 or more 44%, No reply	12% - 16-24 enrolled 35% - 6-15 6% - 25 or more 47%, No reply	0% - 16-24 enrolled 0% - 6-15 enrolled 0% - 25 or more 100%, No reply	26% - 16-24 enrolled 25% - 6-15 8% - 25 or more 42%, No reply None less than 6
Smallest Lab Enrollment	33% - 5-10 enrolled 13% - 1-4 12% - 11-14 5% - 15 or more 37%, no reply	21% - 5-10 enrolled 14% - 1-4 0% - 11-14 7% - 15 or more 57%, no reply	39% - 5-10 enrolled 17% - 1-4 6% - 11-14 0% - 15 or more 39%, No reply	47% - 5-10 enrolled 0% - 1-4 0% - 11-14 6% - 15 or more 47%, No reply	0% - 5-10 enrolled 0% - 1-4 0% - 11-14 0% - 15 or more 100%, No reply	34% - 5-10 enrolled 11% - 1-4 7% - 11-14 5% - 15 or more 43%, No reply
New Ideas	61% - Yes 26% - No 12%, no reply	64% - Yes 0% - No 36%, no reply	44% - Yes 33% - No 22%, no reply	65% - Yes 18% - No 18%, no reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0%, no reply	59% - Yes 23% - No 18%, no reply
New Teaching Methods	56% - Yes 26% - No 18% , no reply	64% - Yes 7% - No 29%, No reply	44% - Yes 28% - No 28%, no reply	53% - Yes 29% - No 18%, no reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0%, no reply	55% - Yes 25% - No 20%, no reply
Home Economics Innovations	68% - Yes 21% - No 12%, no reply	71% - Yes 0% - No 29% , no reply	39% - Yes 39% - Yes 22%, no reply	53% - Yes 29% - No 18%, no reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0%, no reply	60% - Yes 23% - No 17%, no reply
War On Poverty	75% - Yes 11% - No 14%, no reply	71% - Yes 0% - No 29%, no reply	56% - Yes 17% - No 28%, no reply	65% - Yes 18% - No 18%, no reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0%, no reply	69% - Yes 12% - No 19%, no reply
Planned Interdisciplinary Programs	54% - Yes 30% - No 16%, no reply	57% - Yes 7% - No 36%, no reply	28% - Yes 39% - No 33%, no reply	65% - Yes 18% - No 18%, no reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0%, no reply	52% - Yes 27% - No 22%, no reply

Item	State	Land Grant	Private	Denominational	Municipal	All Institutions in this Study
Home Economics Research	47% - Yes 40% - No 12%, No reply	29% - Yes 36% - No 36%, No reply	44% - Yes 28% - No 28%, No reply	41% - Yes 41% - No 18%, No reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0% No reply	44% - Yes 38% - No 19%, No reply
Present Interdisciplinary Programs	60% - Yes 30% - No 10%, No reply	57% - Yes 14% - No 29%, No reply	56% - Yes 17% - No 28%, No reply	41% - Yes 35% - No 24%, No reply	100% - Yes 0% - No 0%, No reply	57% - Yes 26% - No 18%, No reply
Changing Name of Home Economics Unit	12% - Yes 53% - No 21%, Not sure 14%, No reply	29% - Yes 36% - No 7%, Not sure 29%, No reply	11% - Yes 39% - No 28%, Not sure 22%, No reply	6% - Yes 65% - No 6%, Not sure 24%, No reply	0% - Yes 100% - No 0%, Not sure 0%, No reply	13% - Yes 51% - No 18%, Not sure 19%, No reply
Advisability of Recruiting Academically Talented Students						80% - Yes 1% - No 3%, Not sure 17%, No reply
Recruiting More Men Students	72% - Yes 0% - No 16% - Not sure 12%, no reply	71% - Yes 0% - No 0%, Not sure 29%, No reply	56% - Yes 11% - No 6%, Not sure 28%, No reply	53% - Yes 12% - No 12%, Not sure 24%, No reply	50% - Yes 0% - No 50%, Not sure 0%, No reply	66% - Yes 4% - No 12%, Not sure 19%, No reply
Recruiting More Men Faculty	42% - Yes 9% - No 37%, Not sure 12%, No reply	29% - Yes 21% - No 21%, Not sure 29%, No reply	39% - Yes 11% - No 22%, Not sure 28%, No reply	29% - Yes 35% - No 12%, Not sure 24%, No reply	50% - Yes 0% - No 50%, Not sure 0%, No reply	37% - Yes 16% - No 28%, Not sure 19%, No reply
Recruiting More Minors	54% - Yes 9% - No 19%, Not sure 18%, No reply	43% - Yes 14% - No 14%, Not sure 29%, No reply	39% - Yes 17% - No 22%, Not sure 22%, No reply	29% - Yes 6% - No 41%, Not sure 24%, No reply	50% - Yes 50% - No 0%, Not sure 0%, No reply	46% - Yes 11% - No 22%, Not sure 20%, No reply
Require Graduate Record Exam	35% - Yes 53% - No 12%, No reply	29% - Yes 43% - No 29%, No reply	50% - Yes 33% - No 17%, No reply	65% - Yes 18% - No 18%, No reply	0% - Yes 100% - No 0%, No reply	41% - Yes 44% - No 16%, No reply
Training of Home Economics "Program Writers"						20% - Yes 18% - No 41%, Not sure 21%, No reply

in home economics, (9) number of degrees awarded in 1968-69.

A compendium of facts related to the above items has been summarized in the charts on pages 81 to 85.

TYPES OF HOME ECONOMICS COURSES TAUGHT (Data for 98 of 108 institutions)

Ninety-seven percent offered F & N, CD & FR, H. Mgt. & F. Econ.; 28 percent institutional administration and 51 percent family health.

Higher percentages of institutions offer greater numbers of courses in F & N and C & T than the other subject matter areas.

NUMBER OF HOME ECONOMICS UNDERGRADUATE COURSES LISTED IN THE CATALOG

37 percent listed 20-29 home economics courses; 38 was the average for all institutions.
29 percent listed 30-49 home economics courses.
21 percent listed more than 50 courses; 2 percent listed 100 or more.
19 percent listed 19 or less; 1 percent listed less than 10 home economics courses.

FACTS ABOUT HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULA (MAJORS) OFFERED

Home Economics Education and General Home Economics were offered by 97 percent and 61 percent respectively of all institutions. No other major was offered by as many as 50 percent of the institutions.

There was no correlation found between the availability of the various home economics degree programs and the number of graduates produced in the various majors at any degree level.

The reader is asked to consult the main body of the report for the analysis of the home economics semester hour requirements in the various majors.

Larger percentages of denominational (47 percent) and state institutions (37 percent) than other institutions offered two or less majors; 30 percent of state institutions offered 5 or more majors while 57 percent of land-grant schools were in this category.

There was a correlation between the size of the home economics faculty and the number of degree programs offered in the home economics units. More than 95 percent of the institutions with faculties in the ranges of 1-3 and 4-6 persons offered from four or less majors.

With the exception of the largest category of faculties (21 or more persons) one-half or more of all institutions in all categories of faculty size offered four or less different types of majors.

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION

The summary of <u>averages</u> include:

Communication Skills	13.5 percent
Social Studies	14.4 percent
Natural Science	13.3 percent
Humanities	12.1 percent
Phys. Ed. & Health	5.9 percent
Mathematics	5.9 percent

The largest number of institutions (29 percent) require from 36-40 percent of the total hours for graduation in general education courses.

The largest number of institutions (21 percent) require from 13-16 percent in professional education courses.

The largest number of institutions (26 percent) required from 26-30 percent of the total hours for graduation in home economics courses.

Elective credit averaged 11 percent of the total hours required for graduation.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOME ECONOMICS CORE COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The requirements in F & N courses was highest--7 semester hours average.

From 3-6 semester hours were required in C & T, CD & FR, Housing, Equipment, Interior Design, Related Arts and Home Management.

HOME ECONOMICS MINORS

52 percent did not offer minors.
Nearly 40 percent offered only one minor; the range was from 0-8 minors.
Nearly one-half of all schools offering minors required 19-22 semester hours in the minor.

PREPARATION OF GENERALISTS VERSUS SPECIALISTS IN HOME ECONOMICS

<u>Prepare Primarily Generalists</u>:	<u>Prepare Primarily Specialists</u>:
58 percent said "yes"	25 percent said "yes"
6 percent said "no"	46 percent said "no"

RECENT CHANGES IN HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULA

67 percent said "no" (none within the past 3-5 years)
Of the 12 percent who said "yes", 62 percent were from state institutions.

FREQUENCY OF EXTENSION COURSES OTHER THAN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

19 percent said "yes" - they offered Extension courses other than Cooperative Extension.
75 percent of those answering "yes" were from state institutions.

HOME ECONOMICS TELEVISION COURSES FOR CREDIT

Eleven percent of the respondents said "yes" they knew of schools offering TV courses for credit.

FORCES EXERTING GREATEST IMPACT ON CURRICULUM CHANGE

Ranked order of responses from greatest to least influence was:

1- Home economics faculty
2- Administrators
3- Students
4- Legislation
5- High school teachers
6- Non-home economics staff

DESIGNING STANDARDIZED HOME ECONOMICS ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Should we, in higher education, try to design a national standardized achievement test? Of all respondents, 37 percent said "yes"; 24 percent said "no".

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As might have been expected, the characteristics of private and denominational, and state and land-grant institutions are quite similar in many respects. Although the characteristics of state and land-grant institutions differ at many points, they are more similar to each other than when either type of institution is compared with the other three types in this study. The small sample of municipal institutions included makes a meaningful comparison of the characteristics of all types of institutions unfeasible.

It would seem to the author that, in general, home economics curricula in higher education are more stodgy and static than fluid and futuristic. There was little evidence in this study of curricular innovation in terms of new courses or new methods and techniques. Curricula were tightly prescribed; in general, students were given very little latitude in their undergraduate programs for meeting their own felt-needs with their own goal orientations.

Very few institutions reported offerings in field experience, directed work experience, or internships. In the opinion of the author, this type of

course is probably needed in every home economics major today. With the present emphasis in secondary home economics programs on preparation for occupations, it would seem almost imperative for every home economics education major to have some occupational work experience to augment the classroom study of home economics occupations. In many states, the State Department of Vocational Education prescribes this training as a prerequisite for jobs in occupational home economics programs. More home economics students should be having the opportunity to participate in these types of experiences as a part of their prescribed degree program.

It would appear from this study that home economics students have not yet taken an activist's role in pressing for change in home economics curricula on a wide scale. It would be the opinion of the author that this could very well be "around the corner", especially in larger institutions. Why would it not be wise for home economics faculties and administrators to anticipate students' pleas for greater flexibility in program requirements, more opportunity for "pre-professional experience", more opportunity for independent study, more exposure to newer methods of teaching (the use of educational "hardware"), more opportunity for individualized programs and the like, instead of waiting for pressure groups to bring about this change?

It could be postulated that the next few years will see the federal and state government purse strings for higher education very much tightened. Evidences of this are fairly widespread at this writing. When budgets become static or are cut, it will be imperative that home economics units find feasible ways of extending resources to maximize their use. With enthusiasm, because of successful experience in this endeavor, the author would suggest

the planning and implementation of more interdisciplinary and interdepartmental courses and majors (curricula). Interinstitutional curricula planning[15] in home economics seems highly desirable; undoubtedly the master plans of boards of higher education will edict this someday if it is not initiated by the faculties and administrators of institutions.

From this study it would appear that home economists in general are much more interested in recruiting men students than they are in recruiting men faculty members; twice the number of administrators affirmed the former than approved of the latter. This is a very interesting point to contemplate. The author will resist the urge for expository analysis of this item, at this time.

A finding in this study which might have some relation to the above paragraph is that of the attitude of administrators toward changing the name of home economics units. More than one fourth of the administrators from land-grant institutions feel that "...it (is) wise for individual institutions to change the name of their home economics unit without a nationwide coordination in the change." Nearly four times as many administrators in all institutions felt that it was unwise to do this as felt it was wise. Since the author's prejudice on this issue is toward deference to the name of home economics, the latter fact gives some comfort in the face of the rather depressing and unsolved problem. A list of reasons to support both positions (to change or not to change the name of home economics) may be found in the main body of this report.

Administrators were asked if they were making a special effort to help students understand poverty and/or to prepare them for jobs with the culturally and economically disadvantaged. It was very encouraging to have nearly 70 percent affirmative responses to this item; it was discouraging to not see course titles and descriptions in the catalogs reflect this in some way. The author believes that home

economists have the key to the solution of many of the problems of disadvantaged persons and families - it is imperative that we learn to effectively use the key. There is some evidence to show that our middle class values make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to become effective agents of change in the lives of those who need us most. The efforts of home economists should be maximized to correct this criticism.

Until now, home economists have made very little use of mechanical methods (educational technology) in making courses and programs more widely available to both undergraduate and graduate students. Program writers in home economics are not being trained to produce the software for teaching machines; other disciplines continue to outshine home economics in this regard. Readers will recall that the McGrath report[16] recommended wider use of educational television and other media for the dissemination of our relevant subject matter; perhaps future home economics programs will reflect this to a greater degree than is presently true.

This study confirms the fact that a wide variety of home economics programs may be found in diverse types of institutions. Gathering facts and figures about these institutions and their curricula can be of some value as they become stepping stones to better programs. It is uncontroversial, however, to say that the proof of the pudding is in the eating; we can judge the adequacy and the efficacy of our curricula by the degree to which we produce professional home economists who do, indeed become effective agents of change in improving society.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Anna C. Brackett, The Education of American Girls, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1874, p. 13.

[2]Anna L. Rose Hawkes, "Changing Patterns in Women's Lives in 1960", Teachers College Record, 61:409, April 1960.

[3]Marilyn J. Horn, "Accreditation Second Progress Report", Journal of Home Economics, 56:659, November 1964.

[4]Earl McGrath and Jack Johnson, The Changing Mission of Home Economics, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968, Chapters 1 and 2.

[5]Barbara M. Ferrar, "The History of Home Economics Education in America and Its Implication for Liberal Education", Michigan State University, 1964.

[6]Jeannette C. Gorman and Laura Jane Harper, "A Look at the Status of Home Economics in Higher Education", Mimeographed Paper, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1970, p. 5.

[7]Ibid. p. 6.

[8]Ibid. p. 4.

[9]Ibid. p. 18.

[10]Marilyn J. Horn, "Accreditation Second Progress Report", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 56, No. 9, November 1964, pp. 659-662.

[11]Ibid. p. 661.

[12]op. cit.

[13]Eastern Illinois University, General Catalog, 1970, p. 107.

[14]McGrath and Johnson, op. cit., p. 87.

[15]Mary Ruth Swope, Seedbeds of Potential: "Interinstitutional Graduate Programs", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 61, February 1969, p. 115.

[16]McGrath and Johnson, op. cit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brackett, Anna C., The Education of American Girls. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1874.

Eastern Illinois University, General Catalog, Charleston, Illinois, 1970.

Gorman, Jeannette C. and Harper, Laura Jane, "A Look at the Status of Home Economics in Higher Education", Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1970, Mimeographed Paper.

Hawkes, Anna L. Rose, "Changing Patterns in Women's Lives in 1960", Teachers College Record, 61: 409, April 1960.

Horn, Marilyn J., "Accreditation Second Progress Report", Journal of Home Economics, 56: 659, November 1964.

McGrath, Earl and Johnson, Jack, The Changing Mission of Home Economics, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968.

Swope, Mary Ruth, "Interinstitutional Graduate Programs", Journal of Home Economics, 61: 114, 1969.

APPENDICES

TABLE I
TYPE OF SCHOOL TERM, by TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		Quarter	Semester	Trimester	Other	Total
State	#	12	43	1	0.0	56
	%Row	21.4	76.8	1.8	0.0	100%
Land Grant	#	4	10	0.0	0.0	14
	%Row	28.6	71.4	0.0	0.0	100%
Denom.	#	2	14	0.0	1	17
	%Row	11.8	82.4	0.0	5.9	100%
Private	#	0.0	17	0.0	1	18
	%Row	0.0	94.4	0.0	5.6	100%
Munic.	#	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	2
	%Row	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100%
Total	#	18.0	86.0	1.0	2.0	107%
	%Row	16.8	79.6	0.9	1.8	100%

TABLE II
TABULATION OF HOME ECONOMICS COURSES OFFERED, FALL 1968-69.

Subjects		Courses: Not Offered	Not Collected	1	2	3-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	More 16	Total
Food and Nutrition	N	2	10			17	45	20	9	5	108
	%	1.9	9.3			15.7	41.7	18.5	8.3	4.6	100.0
Institution Administration---	N	30	10	9	19	26	9	2	1	2	108
	%	27.8	9.3	8.3	17.6	24.1	8.3	1.9	0.9	1.9	100.1
Clothing & Textiles	N	1	10	1	1	32	38	14	6	5	108
	%	0.9	9.3	0.9	0.9	29.6	35.2	13.0	5.6	4.6	100.0
Child Development Family Relations	N	3	10	11	16	34	18	9	5	2	108
	%	2.8	9.3	10.2	14.8	31.5	16.7	8.3	4.6	1.9	100.1
Housing and Equipment	N	5	10	38	41	8	5	1			108
	%	4.6	9.3	35.2	38.0	7.4	4.6	0.9			100.0
Basic Design	N	6	10	30	27	19	10	3	1	2	108
	%	5.6	9.3	27.8	25.0	17.6	9.3	2.8	0.9	1.9	100.2
Home Management Family Econ	N	3	10	8	38	33	12	4			108
	%	2.8	9.3	7.4	35.2	30.6	11.1	3.7			100.1
Health	N	55	10	39	4						108
	%	50.9	9.3	36.1	3.7						100.0
Demonstration Techniques	N	74	10	22	1		1				108
	%	68.5	9.3	20.4	0.9		0.9				100.0
Home Ec Education	N	24	11	23	14	22	11	1	1	1	108
	%	22.2	10.2	21.3	13.0	20.4	10.2	0.9	0.9	0.9	100.0
Orientation	N	67	10	30	1						108
	%	62.0	9.3	27.8	0.9						100.0
Independent Study	N	76	10	18	1	2	1				108
	%	70.4	9.3	16.7	0.9	1.9	0.9				100.1
Seminar	N	72	10	23	2	1					108
	%	66.7	9.3	21.3	1.9	0.9					100.1
Special Problems	N	77	10	20	1						108
	%	71.3	9.3	18.5	0.9						100.0
Field Experience Work Experience	N	84	10	11	2	1					108
	%	77.8	9.3	10.2	1.9	0.9					100.1
Other	N	67	10	19	6	5		1			108
	%	62.0	9.3	17.6	5.6	4.6		0.9			100.0

TABLE III
NUMBER OF HOME ECONOMICS UNDERGRADUATE COURSES LISTED BY
NUMBER OF FACULTY IN HOME ECONOMICS

		Not recorded or listed	Less than 10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-69	70-99	≥100	Total
Not Mentioned or Recorded	#	0	0	1							1
	%R			100.0							100%
	%C			7.1							
1 - 3	#		1	9	15	2					27
	%R		3.7	33.3	55.6	7.4					100%
	%C		100.0	64.3	37.5	10.0					
4 - 6	#			3	16	6	1				26
	%R			11.5	61.5	23.1	3.8				100%
	%C			21.4	40.0	30.0	9.1				
7 - 9	#			1	6	7	4				18
	%R			5.6	33.3	38.9	22.2	61.1			100%
	%C			7.1	15.0	35.0	36.4	71.4			
10 - 12	#					3	1	1			5
	%R					60.0	20.0	20.0			100%
	%C					15.0	9.1	10.0			
13 - 16	#				3	2	1	6			12
	%R				25.0	16.7	8.3	50.0			100%
	%C				7.5	10.0	9.1	60.0			
17 - 20	#						3		2		5
	%R						60.0		40.0		100%
	%C						27.3		20.0		
21 - 30	#						1	2	2		5
	%R						20.0	40.0	40.0		100%
	%C						9.1	20.0	20.0		
More than 30	#							1	6	2	9
	%R							11.1	66.7	22.2	100%
	%C							10.0	60.0	100.0	
Total	#	0	1	14	40	20	11	10	10	2	108
	%R	0	0.9	13.0	37.0	18.5	10.2	9.3	9.3	1.9	100%

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF THE SEMESTER HOUR REQUIREMENTS OF HOME ECONOMICS COURSES IN THE HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION MAJOR

Course		Number of Semester Hours Required									
		Not Req.	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	14-16	Over 16	Total
Foods	N	5		26	43	20	11	3			108
	%	4.6		24.1	39.8	18.5	10.2	2.8			100.0
Nutrition	N	1	7	9	70	18	2	1			108
	%	0.9	6.5	8.3	64.8	16.7	1.9	0.9			100.0
Clothing	N	5	4	22	44	17	14	2			108
	%	4.6	3.7	20.4	40.7	15.7	13.0	1.9			100.0
Textiles	N	15	25	65	3						108
	%	13.9	23.1	60.2	2.8						100.0
Child Development	N	17	7	51	25	7	1				108
	%	15.7	6.5	47.2	23.1	6.5	0.9				99.9
Family Relations	N	20	14	50	19	3	1	1			108
	%	18.5	13.0	46.3	17.6	2.8	0.9	0.9			100.0
Dress Design	N	85	11	10	2						108
	%	78.7	10.2	9.3	1.9						100.1
Interior Design	N	30	38	35	5						108
	%	27.8	35.2	32.4	4.6						100.0
Housing	N	33	41	31	3						108
	%	30.6	38.0	28.7	2.8						100.1
Equipment	N	41	36	31							108
	%	38.0	33.3	28.7							100.0
Basic Design	N	79	9	17	1		1	1			108
	%	73.1	8.3	15.7	0.9		0.9	0.9			99.8
Family Economics	N	38	16	50	4						108
	%	35.2	14.8	46.3	3.7						100.0
Home Management	N	12	10	44	29	12	1				108
	%	11.1	9.3	40.7	26.9	11.1	0.9				100.0
H.E.Edn. & Stu. Teaching	N	50	10	18	7	2	1	8	5	7	108
	%	46.3	9.3	16.7	6.5	1.9	0.9	7.4	4.6	6.5	100.1
H. E. Electives	N	75	8	5	6	2	4	3	3	2	108
	%	69.4	7.4	4.6	5.6	1.9	3.7	2.8	2.8	1.9	100.1
Health and Home Nursing	N	76	26	6							108
	%	70.4	24.1	5.6							100.1
Seminar in H.E.	N	2	87	17	2						108
	%	1.9	80.6	15.7	1.9						100.1
Other	N	3	80	22	3						108
	%	2.8	74.1	20.4	2.8						100.1

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF THE SEMESTER HOUR REQUIREMENTS OF HOME ECONOMICS COURSES IN THE FOODS AND NUTRITION MAJOR

Courses		Number of Semester Hours Required									
		Not req.	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	14-16	Over 16	Total
Foods	N	72		2	5	8	12	4	5		108
	%	66.7		1.9	4.6	7.4	11.1	3.7	4.6		100.0
Nutrition	N	71	2	5	9	3	12	3	1	2	108
	%	65.7	1.9	4.6	8.3	2.8	11.1	2.8	0.9	1.9	100.0
Clothing	N	89	6	12		1					108
	%	82.4	5.6	11.1		0.9					100.0
Textiles	N	91	7	10							108
	%	84.3	6.5	9.3							100.1
Child Development	N	90	3	12	3						108
	%	83.3	2.8	11.1	2.8						100.0
Family Relations	N	85	7	13	3						108
	%	78.7	6.5	12.0	2.8						100.0
Institution Administration	N	83	2	7	6	4	4		1	1	108
	%	76.9	1.9	6.5	5.6	3.7	3.7		0.9	0.9	100.1
Housing & Equipment	N	88	8	11	1						108
	%	81.5	7.4	10.2	0.9						100.0
Basic Design & Interior Design	N	94	6	8							108
	%	87.0	5.6	7.4							100.0
Family Economics	N	89	4	14	1						108
	%	82.4	3.7	13.0	0.9						100.0
Home Management	N	84	5	12	5	2					108
	%	77.8	4.6	11.1	4.6	1.9					100.0
Other	N	2	97	9							108
	%	1.9	89.8	8.3							100.0

TABLE VI
DISTRIBUTION OF HOME ECONOMICS SEMESTER HOUR
REQUIREMENTS IN VARIOUS HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS

Home Economics Majors Offered		Hours required in each major									
		not req.	16 or less	17-25	26-33	34-40	41-47	48-55	56-70	71 or more	Total
	N	3		3	11	21	30	26	11	3	108
Home Ec. Education	%	2.8		2.8	10.2	19.4	27.8	24.1	10.2	2.8	100.1
	N	42	1	7	18.0	14	11	9	5	1	108
General H. Ec.	%	38.9	0.9	6.5	16.7	13.0	10.2	8.3	4.6	0.9	100.0
	N	77		1	2	7	9	10	1	1	108
Dietetics	%	71.3		0.9	1.9	6.5	8.3	9.3	0.9	0.9	100.0
	N	78		4	4	8	8	5	1		108
Inst. Administration	%	72.2		3.7	3.7	7.4	7.4	4.6	0.9		99.9
Child Development	N	95		1	1	6	2		3		108
Family Relations	%	88.0		0.9	0.9	5.6	1.9		2.8		100.1
	N	92	2	1	4	2	4	2	1		108
Child Development	%	85.2	1.9	0.9	3.7	1.9	3.7	1.9	0.9		100.1
	N	81		2	5	5	7	6	2		108
Fashion Merchandising	%	75.0		1.9	4.6	4.6	6.5	5.6	1.9		100.1
	N	101.0		1	1	2	2	1			108
Dress Design	%	93.5		0.9	0.9	1.9	1.9	0.9			100.0
	N	92		1	4	3	5	2	1		108
Interior Design	%	85.2		0.9	3.7	2.8	4.6	1.9	0.9		100.0
	N	100	1	2			4	1			108
Housing & Equipment	%	92.6	0.9	1.9			3.7	0.9			100.0
	N	70		3	10	9	8	5	3		108
Foods & Nutrition	%	64.8		2.8	9.3	8.3	7.4	4.6	2.8		100.0
	N	84		1	7	5	7	1	3		108
Clothing & Textiles	%	77.8		0.9	6.5	4.6	6.5	0.9	2.8		100.0
Family Economics	N	101	1			2	3		1		108
Home Management	%	93.5	0.9			1.9	2.8		0.9		100.0
	N	102			2	1	2	1			108
H. E. Journalism	%	94.4			1.9	0.9	1.9	0.9			100.0
	N	86		2	4	4	3	6	3		108
Other (eg. Ext. Service)	%	79.6		1.9	3.7	3.7	2.8	5.6	2.8		100.1

TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
FOR MAJORS IN HOME ECONOMICS, FALL 1968-69

Subject Areas			Semester Hours Required								
			Not req.	0 hours, must take	3 or less	4-7	8-11	12-15	16-19	20-29	30 hrs. or more
Communications	Average 13.5	N	1	1		2	25	54	23	2	
		%	0.9	0.9		1.9	23.1	50.0	21.3	1.9	
Social Studies	14.4	N				2	16	61	22	7	
		%				1.9	14.8	56.5	20.4	6.5	
Natural Science	13.26	N				7	39	33	19	10	
		%				6.5	36.1	30.6	17.6	9.3	
Math	5.9	N	40	1	37	27	3				
		%	37.0	0.9	34.3	25.0	2.8				
Physical Education & Health	5.9	N	7	12	29	56	3	1			
		%	6.5	11.1	26.9	51.9	2.8	0.9			
Humanities	12.06	N	1	4	5	14	30	20	11	12	11
		%	0.9	3.7	4.6	13.0	27.8	18.5	10.2	11.1	10.2

TABLE VIII
DISTRIBUTION OF SEMESTER HOURS OF GENERAL EDUCATION
SUBJECTS REQUIRED OF HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS, FALL 1968-69.

Subject Area		Hours Required									
		0 hrs. must take	Not Req.	2 or Less	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15 or More
English	N	2	1		6	59	9	14	13	3	1
	%	1.9	0.9		5.6	54.6	8.3	13.0	12.0	2.8	0.9
Speech	N	1	34	23	48	2					
	%	0.9	31.5	21.3	44.4	1.9					
Art	N	2	39	13	46	7	1				
	%	1.9	36.1	12.0	42.6	6.5	0.9				
Drama	N	2	103	3							
	%	1.9	95.4	2.8							
Foreign Language	N	2	81		4	6	5	3	5		2
	%	1.9	75.0		3.7	5.6	4.6	2.7	4.6		1.9
English/Am. Lit.	N	2	40	1	45	18	1	1			
	%	1.9	37.0	0.9	41.7	16.7	0.9	0.9			
Music	N	2	75	14	17						
	%	1.9	69.4	13.0	15.7						
Philosophy	N	2	65	2	25	2	1	8	1		2
	%	1.9	60.2	1.9	23.1	1.9	0.9	7.4	0.9		1.9
Theology	N	2	83	1	5	3		6	5	1	2
	%	1.9	76.9	0.9	4.6	2.8		5.6	4.6	0.9	1.9
Bible	N	2	101		3		1		1		
	%	1.9	93.5		2.8		0.9		0.9		
Anthropology	N	2	99	1	6						
	%	1.9	91.7	0.9	5.6						
Economics	N	2	46	5	49	6					
	%	1.9	42.6	4.6	45.4	5.6					
Government	N	2	87	1	15	3					
	%	1.9	80.6	0.9	13.9	2.8					

TABLE VIII - CONTINUED

Subject Area		Hours Required									
		0 hrs. must take	Not Req.	2 or Less	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15 or More
History	N	2	21	1	42	33	6	2		1	
	%	1.9	19.4	0.9	38.9	30.6	5.6	1.9		0.9	
Psychology	N	2	31	6	61	5	2	1			
	%	1.9	28.7	5.6	56.5	4.6	1.9	0.9			
Sociology	N	2	40	7	49	8	1				1
	%	1.9	37.0	6.5	45.4	7.4	0.9				0.9
Political Science	N	2	84	5	16		1				
	%	1.9	77.8	4.6	14.8		0.9				
Biology, Biol. Sci.	N	2	9	2	53	23	14	5			
	%	1.9	8.3	1.9	49.1	21.3	13.0	4.6			
Bacteriology	N	2	91		15						
	%	1.9	84.3		13.9						
Physiology	N	2	83	1	22						
	%	1.9	76.9	0.9	20.4						
Chemistry	N	2	15	2	39	16	27	5	1		1
	%	1.9	13.9	1.9	36.1	14.8	25.0	4.6	0.9		0.9
Physics	N	2	75	3	27	1					
	%	1.9	69.4	2.8	25.0	0.9					
Physical Science	N	2	88	3	11	4					
	%	1.9	81.5	2.8	10.2	3.7					
Zoology	N	2	98	2	4	2					
	%	1.9	90.7	1.9	3.7	1.9					
P. E.	N	12	10	32	49	3	2				
	%	11.1	9.3	29.6	45.4	2.8	1.9				
Health	N		72	24	11				1		
	%		66.7	22.2	10.2				0.9		

TABLE IX
GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		Not Required	Less Than 30%	31-35 %	36-40%	41-45%	46-50%	51-55%	56-60%	61-70%	≥71%	Total
	#	0.0	4	6	12	20	8	4	3	0	0	57
State	% Row	0.0	7.0	10.5	21.1	35.1	14.0	7.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	80.0	50.0	63.2	64.5	47.1	25.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	
	#	0	1	5	1	6	1	0	0	0.0	0.0	14
Land Grant	% Row		7.1	35.7	7.1	42.9	7.1					100%
	% Col	0.0	20.0	41.7	5.3	19.4	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	#	0.0	0	0	3	3	3	7	1	0	0	17
Denom.	% Row				17.6	17.6	17.6	41.2	5.9			100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	9.7	17.6	43.8	14.3	0.0	0.0	
	#	0	0	1	2	1	5	5	3	1	0	18
Private	% Row			5.6	11.1	5.6	27.8	27.8	16.7	5.6		100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	8.3	10.5	3.2	29.4	31.3	42.9	100.0	0.0	
	#	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Munic.	% Row				50.0	50.0						100%
	% Col	0.0			5.3	3.2						
Private	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
&	% Row											100%
Munic.	% Col											
	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	% Row											100%
	% Col											
	#	0	5	12	19	31	17	16	7	1	0	108
Total	% Row	0	4.6	11.1	17.6	28.7	15.7	14.8	6.5	0.9	0	100

TABLE X
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		Not Required	Less Than 5%	5-8%	9-12%	13-16%	17-20%	21-24%	25-28%	≥29%	Total
	#	7	2	9	10	15	7	2	3	2	57
State	% Row	12.3	3.5	15.8	17.5	26.3	12.3	3.5	5.3	3.5	100%
	% Col	53.8	25.0	52.9	52.6	65.2	43.8	33.3	75.0	100.0	
	#	0	4	2	1	3	2	2	0	0	14
Land Grant	% Row	0.0	28.6	14.3	7.1	21.4	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	50.0	11.8	5.3	13.0	12.5	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	#	3	0	2	4	2	4	2	0	0	17
Denom.	% Row	17.6	0.0	11.8	23.5	11.8	23.5	11.8	0.0	0.0	100%
	% Col	23.1	0.0	11.8	21.1	8.7	25.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	#	3	2	4	3	2	3	0	1	0	18
Private	% Row	16.7	11.1	22.2	16.7	11.1	16.7	0.0	5.6	0.0	100%
	% Col	23.1	25.0	23.5	15.8	8.7	18.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	
	#	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Munic.	% Row				50.0	50.0					100%
	% Col				5.3	5.3					
Private	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
&	% Row										100%
Munic.	% Col										
	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	% Row										100%
	% Col										
	#	13	8	17	19	23	16	6	4	2	108
Total	% Row	12.0	7.4	15.7	17.6	21.3	14.8	5.6	3.7	1.9	100

TABLE XI
HOME ECONOMICS REQUIREMENTS, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		Not Required	10 or Less	11-15%	16-20%	21-25%	26-30%	31-35%	36-40%	41-45%	46-50%	Total
State	#	0	0	0	3	4	15	15	8	7	5	57
	% Row	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	7.0	26.3	26.3	14.0	12.3	8.8	100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	26.7	53.6	55.6	57.1	63.6	100.0	
Land Grant	#	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4	1	0	14
	% Row	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	7.1	42.9	28.6	7.1	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	3.6	22.2	28.6	9.1	0.0	
Denom.	#	0	0	0	1	6	8	2	0	0	0	17
	% Row	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	35.3	47.1	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	40.0	28.6	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Private	#	0	0	1	1	5	4	3	2	2	0	18
	% Row	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.6	27.8	22.2	16.7	11.1	11.1	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	100.0	14.3	33.3	14.3	11.1	14.3	18.2	0.0	
Munic.	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
	% Row	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	9.1	0.0	
Private & Munic.	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Others	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Total	#	0	0	1	7	15	28	27	14	11	5	108
	% Row	0	0	0.9	6.5	13.9	25.9	25.0	13.0	10.2	4.6	100%

TABLE XII
ELECTIVES, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No mention or none	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	22-24	≥24	Total
State	#	7	6	10	10	10	3	6	4	1	0	57
	% Row	12.3	10.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	5.3	10.5	7.0	1.8	0.0	100%
	% Col	70.0	54.5	58.8	58.8	66.7	33.3	54.5	36.4	50.0	0.0	
Land Grant	#	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	1	2	14
	% Row	7.1	7.1	0.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	21.4	21.4	7.1	14.3	100%
	% Col	10.0	9.1	0.0	5.9	6.7	11.1	27.3	27.3	50.0	40.0	
Denom.	#	1	1	4	3	3	2	1	1	0	1	17
	% Row	5.9	5.9	23.5	17.6	17.6	11.8	5.9	5.9	0.0	5.9	100%
	% Col	10.0	9.1	23.5	17.6	20.0	22.2	9.1	9.1	0.0	20.0	
Private	#	1	2	3	3	1	2	1	3	0	2	18
	% Row	5.6	11.1	16.7	16.7	5.6	11.1	5.6	16.7	0.0	11.1	100%
	% Col	10.0	18.2	17.6	17.6	6.7	22.2	9.1	27.3	0.0	40.0	
Munic.	#	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	% Row	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100%
	% Col		9.1				11.1					
Private & Munic.	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Others	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Total	#	10	11	17	17	15	9	11	11	2	5	108
	% Row	9.3	10.2	15.7	15.7	13.9	8.3	10.2	10.2	1.9	4.6	100%

U118

TABLE XIII
TOTAL HOURS REQUIRED, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		Less than 120 sem.	120-122	123-124	125-126	127-128	129-130	131-132	133-134	≥135	Total
State	#	0	3	11	4	13	12	7	5	2	57
	% Row	0.0	5.3	19.3	7.0	22.8	21.1	12.3	8.8	3.5	100%
	% Col	0.0	23.1	78.6	66.7	44.8	63.2	53.8	71.4	28.6	
Land Grant	#	0	3	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	14
	% Row	0.0	21.4	7.1	14.3	14.3	21.4	7.1	7.1	7.1	100%
	% Col	0.0	23.1	7.1	33.3	6.9	15.8	7.7	14.3	14.3	
Denom.	#	0	3	1	0	6	2	3	1	1	17
	% Row	0.0	17.6	5.9	0.0	35.3	11.8	17.6	5.9	5.9	100%
	% Col	0.0	23.1	7.1	0.0	20.7	10.5	23.1	14.3	14.3	
Private	#	0	4	0	0	7	2	2	0	3	18
	% Row	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	38.9	11.1	11.1	0.0	16.7	100%
	% Col	0.0	30.8	0.0	0.0	24.1	10.5	15.4	0.0	42.9	
Munic.	#	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	% Row	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100%
	% Col	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Private & Munic.	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Row										100%
	% Col										
Others	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% Row										100%
	% Col										
Total	#	0	13	14	6	29	19	13	7	7	108
	% Row	0	12.0	13.0	5.6	26.9	17.6	12.0	6.5	6.5	100%

TABLE XIV
CHARACTERISTICS OF HOME ECONOMICS CORE
REQUIREMENTS IN RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Item		Semester Hour Requirements									
		None	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	14-16	17 Or More	Total
Food and Nutrition	N	48	4	13	12	11	14	6			108
	%	44.4	3.7	12.0	11.1	10.2	13.0	5.6			100.0
Clothing and Textiles	N	58	9	16	14	4	5	2			108
	%	53.7	8.3	14.8	13.0	3.7	4.6	1.9			100.0
Child Development & Family Relations	N	56	6	20	17	5	3	1			108
	%	51.9	5.6	18.5	15.7	4.6	2.8	0.9			100.0
Housing Equipment & Interior Design	N	80	7	16	5						108
	%	74.1	6.5	14.8	4.6						100.0
Related Arts	N	78	7	15	7	1					108
	%	72.2	6.5	13.9	6.5	0.9					100.0
Home Management Family Econ.	N	61	11	12	18	5	1				108
	%	56.5	10.2	11.1	16.7	4.6	0.9				100.0
Home Economics Seminar	N	98	8	2							108
	%	90.7	7.4	1.9							100.0
Introduction &/Or Orientation to Home Economics	N	93	13	2							108
	%	86.1	12.0	1.9							100.0
Health & Nursing	N	99	8	1							108
	%	91.7	7.4	0.9							100.0
Other	N	105	3								108
	%	97.2	2.8								100.0

TABLE XV
SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED IN
MINORS INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY

Subject area Minor		Semester hours required for this minor									
		Don't offer	Less 12	13-15	16-18	19-22	23-27	28-32	33-36	More 36	Total
General H. Ec	N	66	5	2	12	17	5	1			108
	%	61.1	4.6	1.9	11.1	15.7	4.6	0.9			99.9
Food & Nutrition	N	103			2	1	1	1			108
	%	95.4			1.9	0.9	0.9	0.9			100.0
Clothing & Textiles	N	101			3	2	2				108
	%	93.5			2.8	1.9	1.9				100.1
Child Development	N	104			4						108
	%	96.3			3.7						100.0
Family Relations	N	103			3	1	1				108
	%	95.4			2.8	0.9	0.9				100.0
Home Ec. Education	N	98		1	2	3	3	1			108
	%	90.7		0.9	1.9	2.8	2.8	0.9			100.0
Other H. Ec. Minors	N	104			2	1	1				108
	%	96.3			1.9	0.9	0.9				100.0

TABLE XVI
LARGEST LECTURE, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No Mention	Less than 20	12-30	31-40	41-50	51-70	71-100	101-150	151-200	≥201	Total
State	#	10	1	4	6	5	15	5	7	2	2	57
	% Row	17.5	1.8	7.0	10.5	8.8	26.3	8.8	12.3	3.5	3.5	100%
	% Col	40.0	25.0	33.3	40.0	55.6	71.4	71.4	77.8	50.0	100.0	
Land Grant	#	4		1	1		4	1	2	1		14
	% Row	28.6		7.1	7.1		28.6	7.1	14.3	7.1		100%
	% Col	16.0		8.3	6.7		19.0	14.3	22.2	25.0		
Denom.	#	5		3	3	4		1		1		17
	% Row	29.4		17.6	17.6	23.5		5.9		5.9		100%
	% Col	20.0		25.0	20.0	44.4		14.3		25.0		
Private	#	4	3	4	5		2					18
	% Row	22.2	16.7	22.2	27.8		11.1					100%
	% Col	16.0	75.0	33.3	33.3		9.5					
Munic.	#	2										2
	% Row	100.0										100%
	% Col	8.0										
Private & Munic.	#											0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Others	#											0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Total	#	25	4	12	15	9	21	7	9	4	2	108
	% Row	23.1	3.7	11.1	13.9	8.3	19.4	6.5	8.3	3.7	1.9	100%

TABLE XVII
AVERAGE LECTURE ENROLLMENT, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No Ans.	0-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	> 60	Total
	#	10	0	4	11	11	12	4	3	1	1	57
State	% Row	17.5		7.0	19.3	19.3	21.1	7.0	5.3	1.8	1.8	100%
	% Col	40.0		33.3	47.8	68.8	66.7	66.7	100.0	50.0	50.0	
	#	4	0	0	2	2	3	1	0	1	1	14
Land Grant	% Row	28.6			14.3	14.3	21.4	7.1		7.1	7.1	100%
	% Col	16.0			8.7	12.5	16.7	16.7		50.0	50.0	
	#	5	0	3	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	17
Denom.	% Row	29.4		17.6	23.5	17.6	5.9	5.9				100%
	% Col	20.0		25.0	17.4	18.8	5.6	16.7				
	#	4	1	5	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	18
Private	% Row	22.2	5.6	27.8	33.3		11.1					100%
	% Col	16.0	100.0	41.7	26.1		11.1					
	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Munic.	% Row	100.0										100%
	% Col	8.0										
Private	#											0
&	% Row											100%
Munic.	% Col											
	#											0
Others	% Row											100%
	% Col											
	#	25	1	12	24	16	18	6	3	2	2	108
Total	% Row	23	1	11	21	15	17	6	3	2	2	100

TABLE XVIII
SMALLEST LECTURE ENROLLMENT, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No Ans.	0-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	14-16	17-19	≥20	Total
State	#	11	1	7	5	7	13	9	4	0	0	57
	% Row	19.3	1.8	12.3	8.8	12.3	22.8	15.8	7.0			100%
	% Col	42.3	16.7	50.0	27.8	53.8	86.7	81.8	80.0	0	0	
Land Grant	#	4	2	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	14
	% Row	28.6	14.3		42.9			7.1	7.1			100%
	% Col	15.4	33.3		33.3			9.1	20.0			
Denom.	#	5	2	2	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	17
	% Row	29.4	11.8	11.8	23.5	17.6	5.9					100%
	% Col	19.2	33.3	14.3	22.2	23.1	6.7					
Private	#	4	1	5	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	18
	% Row	22.2	5.6	27.8	16.7	16.7	5.6	5.6				100%
	% Col	15.4	16.7	35.7	16.7	23.1	6.7	9.1				
Munic.	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% Row	100.0										100%
	% Col	7.7										
Private & Munic.	#											0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Others	#											0
	% Row											100%
	% Col											
Total	#	26	6	14	18	13	15	11	5	0	0	108
	% Row	24.1	5.6	13.0	16.7	12.0	13.9	10.2	4.6			100%

Table XIX
SMALLEST LECTURE ENROLLMENT,
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATION

		No Answer	0-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-13	14-16	17-19	20	Total
Autonomous	#	6	2	5	6	3	5	5	1	0	0	33
Separate	%	18.2	6.1	15.2	18.2	9.1	15.2	15.2	3.0			100%
Unit	%	23.1	33.3	35.7	33.3	23.1	33.3	45.5	20.0			
Education	#	3	0	1	2	2	3	1				12
Unit	%	25.0		8.3	16.7	16.7	25.0	8.3				100%
	%	11.5		7.1	11.1	15.4	20.0	9.1				
Fine or	#				1		2	3				6
Professional	%				16.7		33.3	50.0				100%
Arts Unit	%				5.6		13.3	27.3				
Applied Arts	#	5	2	2	4	3	2	1	2			21
or	%	23.8	9.5	9.5	19.0	14.3	9.5	4.8	9.5			100%
Sciences Unit	%	19.2	33.3	14.3	22.2	23.1	13.3	9.1	40.0			
Agriculture	#		1		2				1			4
Unit	%		25.0		50.0				25.0			100%
	%		16.7		11.1				20.0			
Social	#	2				1	1					4
Sciences	%	50.0				25.0	25.0					100%
Unit	%	7.7				7.7	6.7					
Natural	#	3		2	2							7
Science	%	42.9		28.6	28.6							100%
Unit	%	11.5		14.3	11.1							
Not	#	3		3	1	4	1	1	1			14
Indicated or	%	21.4		21.4	7.1	28.6	7.1	7.1	7.1			100%
Seen	%	11.5		21.4	5.6	30.8	6.7	9.1	20.0			
Other	#	4	1	1			1					7
Unit	%	57.1	14.3	14.3			14.3					100%
	%	15.4	16.7	7.1			6.7					
Total	#	26	6	14	18	13	15	11	5	0	0	108
	%	24.1	5.6	13.0	16.7	12.0	13.9	10.2	4.6	0	0	100

TABLE XX
LARGEST LAB ENROLLMENT, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No Answer	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-40	41-50	More than 50	Total
State	#	18	0	0	1	12	7	6	10		3	57
	% Row	31.6			1.8	21.1	12.3	10.5	17.5	0.0	5.3	100.1
	% Col	43.9			14.3	54.5	53.8	66.7	90.9		100.0	
Land Grant	#	7	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	14
	% Row	50.0				21.4	7.1	14.3	7.1			99.9
	% Col	17.1				13.6	7.7	22.2	9.1			
Denom.	#	7	0	0	2	3	2	1	0	2	0	17
	% Row	41.2			11.8	17.6	11.8	5.9		11.8		100.1
	% Col	17.1			28.6	13.6	15.4	11.1		100.0		
Private	#	7	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	18
	% Row	38.9			22.2	22.2	16.7					100.0
	% Col	17.1			57.1	18.2	23.1					
Munic.	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% Row	100.0										100.0
	% Col	4.9										
Private & Munic.	#											0
	% Row											100.0
	% Col											
Others	#											0
	% Row											100.0
	% Col											
Total	#	41	0	0	7	22	13	9	11	2	3	108
	% Row	38	0	0	6	20	12	8	10	2	3	100

926

TABLE XXI
AVERAGE LAB ENROLLMENT, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No Answer	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-18	19-21	22-24	25-27	28-31	More Than 31	Total
State	#	20	0	2	10	10	5	5	3	2	0	57
	% Row	35.1		3.5	17.5	17.5	8.8	8.8	5.3	3.5		100.0
	% Col	44.4		22.2	55.6	71.4	62.5	83.3	60.0	100.0		
Land Grant	#	7	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	14
	% Row	50.0		7.1		14.3	7.1	7.1	7.1		7.1	99.8
	% Col	15.6		11.1		14.3	12.5	16.7	20.0		100.0	
Denom.	#	8	0	3	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	17
	% Row	47.1		17.6	17.6		11.8		5.9			100.0
	% Col	17.8		33.3	16.7		25.0		20.0			
Private	#	8	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	18
	% Row	44.4		16.7	27.8	11.1						100.0
	% Col	17.8		33.3	27.8	14.3			0.0			
Munic.	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% Row	100.0										100.0
	% Col	4.4										
Private & Munic.	#											0
	% Row											100.0
	% Col											
Others	#											0
	% Row											100.0
	% Col											
Total	#	45	0	9	18	14	8	6	5	2	1	108
	% Row	42	0	8	17	13	7	6	5	2	1	100

TABLE XXII
SMALLEST LAB ENROLLMENT, BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		No Answer	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15-16	More Than 16	Total
State	#	21	2	5	7	6	6	7	0	1	2	57
	% Row	36.8	3.5	8.8	12.3	10.5	10.5	12.3	0.0	1.8	3.5	100.0
	% Col	45.7	40.0	71.4	43.8	46.2	75.0	87.5		33.3	100.0	
Land Grant	#	8	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	14
	% Row	57.1	14.3		14.3		7.1			7.1		100.0
	% Col	17.4	40.0		12.5		12.5			33.3		
Denom.	#	8	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	1	0	17
	% Row	47.1			17.6	23.5	5.9			5.9		100.0
	% Col	17.4			18.8	30.8	12.5			33.3		
Private	#	7	1	2	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	18
	% Row	38.9	5.6	11.1	22.2	16.7		5.6				100.0
	% Col	15.2	20.0	28.6	25.0	23.1		12.5				
Munic.	#	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% Row	100.0										100.0
	% Col	4.3										
Private & Munic.	#											0
	% Row											100.0
	% Col											
Others	#											0
	% Row											100.0
	% Col											
Total	#	46	5	7	16	13	8	8	0	3	2	108
	% Row	42.6	4.6	6.5	14.8	12.0	7.4	7.4	0	2.8	1.9	100

NAME OF YOUR INSTITUTION

APPENDIX B

Home Economics Curricula in Higher Education

General Information Please tell us:

1. Number of home economics majors enrolled in your school Fall 1968-69. (Fill in answer) (1)_____total undergraduate majors? (2) _____total graduate majors?

2. Approximate distribution

	Undergraduates	Graduates		Undergraduates	Graduates
F and N	_____	_____	Dietetics	_____	_____
C and T	_____	_____	Insti. Adm.	_____	_____
CD and FR	_____	_____	Journalism	_____	_____
H. Ec. Educ.	_____	_____	Others:___	_____	_____
General Home Ec.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
H. Ec. in Bus.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. The size of home economic course enrollments in the Fall 1968-69. (Fill in numbers.)

	Lecture	Lab
Largest class enrollment		
Average class enrollment		
Smallest class enrollment		

4. Number of degrees awarded in the 1968-69 school year:

	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorates
Summer 1968			
Fall 1968			
Winter 1968			
Spring 1969			

5. What is your estimate of the number of 1968-69 seniors who will go on for advanced work within the next three years? _____

6. What is your estimate of the number of 1968-69 seniors who will accept employment in elementary school teaching? _____

7. Number of full-time equivalent staff Fall 1968-69: ____Instructional ___Research

Please mark an X in the column that most nearly describes your opinion regarding the following questions:

Yes	No	Not Sure	Should home economics in higher education:
			8. prepare undergraduates primarily as "generalists"?
			9. prepare undergraduates primarily as "specialists"?
			10. be training "program writers" for computer assisted instruction, dial-access courses and the like? Explain:_____
			11. be making a "special effort" to recruit the academically talented?
			12. design a national standardized home economics achievement test?
			13. make an effort to recruit more home economics minors? Comment:
			14. offer associate (2-year degree programs in 4-year institutions:
			15. recruit substantially more men as students?

Yes	No	Not Sure	Should home economics in higher education:
			16. design special programs for the "older" undergraduate student? If your answer is "Yes", what are your plans? _____
			17. design refresher courses especially for the "out-of-date" home economics graduate?
			18. recruit substantially more men as faculty?
			19. in you opinion, is it wise for individual institutions to change the name of their home economic unit without a nation-wide coordination in the change? Comment: _____

Please check either "yes" or "no" for the following and add your comments.

Yes	No	At your institution, within the past 3 to 5 years:
		20. have you dropped any home economics curriculum or major? If yes, what? _____
		21. have you added any new home economics curriculum or major? If yes, what? _____
		22. has your home economics unit changed its name? If yes, former name? _____ present name? _____
		23. have you tried any innovations in home economics course offerings? _____
		24. have you tried any innovative approaches in teaching methods? Explain: _____
		25. do you have any "new ideas" in the planning stage for the 1969-1974 period in the area below: A. teaching methods? _____ B. course offerings? (Do you offer any special honors courses in home economics?) Explain: _____ C. new degree programs? _____
		26. will your institution accept educational television courses for credit to meet undergraduate degree requirements?
		27. will your institution accept educational television courses for credit to meet graduate degree requirements?
		28. will your institution accept correspondence courses for credit to meet undergraduate degree requirements?
		29. will your institution accept correspondence courses for credit to meet graduate degree requirements?
		30. in the past five years has your institution paid anyone to serve as curriculum consultant to you and your faculty in updating the course offerings at your institution? Who was the consultant? _____
		31. does your institution accept any home economics courses in meeting general education requirements? List the course titles: _____
		32. does your institution require seniors to take the graduate record examination or another type of comprehensive exam (i.e., National Teachers Examination) prior to baccalaureate graduations? Specify: _____
		33. are you making any special effort to encourage research projects at the undergraduate level? Explain: _____

Yes	No	
		34. are you presently offering any interdisciplinary or interdepartmental programs? Explain: _____
		35. within the next 5 years do you plan any interdisciplinary programs? Explain: _____
		36. are you making a special effort to help students understand poverty and/or to prepare them for jobs with the culturally and economically disadvantaged? Explain: _____
		37. do you offer extension home economics courses through a University Extension program other than cooperative extension? _____
		38. do you know of any school which offers home economics television courses for credit? _____

39. What forces at your institution have the greatest impact on bringing about home economics curriculum change? Place a "1" before the forces that have the greatest impact, a "2" before the forces with moderate impact, and a "3" before the forces that have little or no impact.

___ students
___ faculty
___ administrator
___ faculty outside of home economics
___ high school teachers or administrators
___ legislation, either state or national
___ other: (specify) _____